

was fascinated by the way in which the power authority intends to tap additional kilowatts at Niagara Falls.

Under cover of darkness, when the thundering tourist attraction is not at stake, water will be drawn from the Niagara River and held in reservoirs and pools. Then, during daylight, it will be poured through canals and dropped some 300 feet via penstocks to a huge powerplant at the bottom of the yawning Niagara gorge. Thus the maximum amount of energy will be produced in the daytime, while factories are working full shift. Nor will it be necessary to spoil the beauty and grandeur of the falls when pilgrims and newlyweds are looking at one of the world's famous spectacles.

One basic difference between industries locating on the St. Lawrence and those in

our own Columbia Basin must be emphasized. The plants taking advantage of the low-cost kilowatts of the St. Lawrence frontier are only a midiron shot from millions of customers in the Eastern States. In the Northwest, by comparison, the long freight haul still intervenes across the continent and over the intermountain barrier—and freight rates, alas, are rising with every passing year of biennium.

Readers of this book review will be interested to learn that the Messrs. Sufrin and Palmer are opposed to special tax concessions for new industries. They support general New York State policy in this respect. They believe that tax rebates or "forgiveness" for new plants are almost always at the expense of existing industries in that particular community. They also warn that fly-by-night

factories tend to take advantage of temporary tax concessions, and then perhaps migrate somewhere else, leaving behind a legacy of unemployed families and unsupported public facilities.

The cost of the St. Lawrence Seaway is about \$1 billion with some \$300 million invested by the two national governments in the navigation facilities and the rest in the intricate powerplants. According to present schedules, the seaway will be completed sometime during 1959 "and, when it is finished, it will provide a 27-foot channel between Montreal and the Great Lakes." Advocates of Columbia River and Snake River navigation then will have a real show-case to point to, when they seek appropriations and further authorizations from a somewhat reluctant administration or Congress.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1958

Rev. Calvin Thielman, minister, the Presbyterian Church, Waynesville, N. C., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, O God, our Father, for all Thy goodness to the children of men; for the word of prophet and apostle, given for the enlightenment of the world; for the supreme revelation of Thyself in Thy Son, who became bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, to redeem us; for the gift of Thy Holy Spirit, whose power is sufficient to restore our hearts and our world to the order that will please Thee.

We entreat Thy forgiveness for the shameful peace which we have often made with our temptations.

Create within us a holy dissatisfaction with all that is base and low. Dispel from our minds the stale languor of past failures that haunt us.

Lift us to a new vision of our work in its eternal perspective. Grant us the courage to be expendable in the fight for that which is right.

Make us deaf to harmful praise. Help us to sense the littleness that clings to deeds of vanity.

We intercede for Thy mercy on behalf of the people we represent.

We remember before Thee, our Father, the members of our families, our friends, and our staff, whose costly sacrifices have made it possible for us to serve here. Tender to them a solemn sense of pride in their unsung labors for the Republic.

Help us to make the clean and unsoiled hours of this session fruitful for good. In Jesus' name. Amen.

REV. CALVIN THIELMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very proud to be present today to receive the inspiration which comes from the wonderful prayer delivered by a loyal and devoted friend of mine and a former Texan, who has moved on to other fields in North Carolina.

I am pleased to state that his contributions to our State, even when he was a boy in high school, and during his

early years in college, were great and enduring.

I know of no more dedicated person.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1958.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 14, 1958, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the Senate of March 14, 1958,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on March 15, 1958, signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2120) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, Mercedes division, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1519. An act for the relief of Isaac Lidji, Henry Isaac Lidji, and Sylvio Isaac Gattegno; and

H. J. Res. 509. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, N. Y., from May 7 to May 17, 1958.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in that connection be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—THE ROAD BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I had anticipated that sometime this week the Senate would proceed to the consideration of the road bill, which on last Friday was ordered reported by the Public Works Committee. I had hoped the bill would be taken up by the Senate on Tuesday or Wednesday.

However, a very unusual situation developed in the Public Works Committee: Some of the members asked that the bill not be reported until minority views could be prepared, and found that it would be necessary to hold up that important, emergency measure for more than 1 week.

I hope it will be possible to work out some arrangement whereby the bill can at least be reported by the middle of the week, and whereby the Senate can proceed to its consideration in the latter part of the week.

In any event, I believe prompt action on the bill is not only desirable, but essential, particularly in view of the fact that 5,200,000 of the American people are unemployed, and the fact that the purpose of the bill is not only to provide good roads, but also to provide jobs for

Americans. I am told that it is estimated that 90 cents out of every dollar spent for roads goes for labor.

So, Mr. President, I believe it is rather difficult to justify taking more than 1 week to write a report and submit it to the Senate.

In any event, if the schedule which has been agreed upon is followed, the bill should be available for consideration by the Senate on Monday.

Mr. President, I anticipate that this week will be a relatively light one for the Senate. I do not believe the Senate will hold any night sessions this week; and I do not expect that the daily sessions will begin before noon. There may be exceptions, but at this time I do not anticipate any.

However, in view of the fact that I had hoped and believed, and had assured certain Senators, that the Senate would commence an Easter recess on Thursday, April 3, following the conclusion of its business on that day, and in view of the fact that the House of Representatives has made a similar arrangement, I wish all Members to be on notice that we hope to have the Senate complete its action on the road bill before the Senate commences its Easter recess. Therefore, if it is necessary for the Senate to meet early in the mornings and to continue its sessions until late in the evenings on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week, the leadership will ask that it be done, because I believe it is very important to the country that the bill be passed.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

THE TEXAS QUARTERLY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the University of Texas has just published the first number of a splendid magazine, the Texas Quarterly.

This is an auspicious event for Texans, and for enlightened men everywhere. It is another indication that the University of Texas is responding to the immense challenges that face us today—challenges that face us not only in the world of missiles and satellites, but also in the world of scholarship and humane education.

The Texas Quarterly reflects the spirit of a great institution of learning. In the Texas Quarterly, no artificial barriers are set up between men of science, men of Government and business, and men of art. As the Quarterly's editor, Dean Harry Ransom says in this issue:

A university must not prize, even when it must acknowledge, artificially neat little packages which are the stock in trade of many departmental systems. It must recognize the unity of knowledge.

Mr. President, the Texas Quarterly is founded on this belief. Its pages are open to physicists and poets. It will provide a communications center for men of ideas and experience in many fields of endeavor.

I know the Senate will join me in congratulating the University of Texas on this splendid beginning, and in wishing

the Texas Quarterly a long and informative life.

So that the Quarterly may be more easily available to my colleagues, the Members of the Senate of the United States, I have purchased a subscription to the Texas Quarterly for the Senate Library. I hope my colleagues will drop by the Senate Library and will examine our university's great, new publication.

Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

THE PRESENT SITUATION—ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SENATE LAST WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to express to the Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, my appreciation for their indulgence and their understanding during the sessions last week. It was one of the most productive and constructive weeks I have ever observed since I became a Member of the Senate.

During that week the Senate passed a housing bill which provides for 200,000 new homes. I am told that there will be employed approximately 3½ man-years per home, or a total of 750,000 new jobs, as a result of the enactment of that bill. The bill was reported to the Senate by a bipartisan vote. It was passed by the Senate by a vote of—as I recall—86 to 0. It is a comprehensive bill; it is a far-reaching bill. It is a bill designed to operate in the spirit and the atmosphere of our free-enterprise system.

Mr. President, I am confident of the future of this country. I believe in its possibilities. I do not think we have even skimmed the surface in exploring the avenues we should explore. I believe the statement that the great President Franklin D. Roosevelt made when he was inaugurated in 1933 was never truer than it is today, namely—

The only thing we have to fear is fear itself.

But there are many unemployed in this country. We must face up to that problem.

Last week there were reported from the appropriate committees two resolutions urging acceleration of approximately \$7 billion worth of public works. Those resolutions were adopted by this body with only one dissenting vote.

The farmers of this country have been in an economic decline. Their income has dropped from \$18 billion a year to \$11 billion a year, to the point where those who lend the money—and there are only 14,000 of them—last year took more in interest income than the 20 million people who produce the Nation's food and fiber. Interest income rose to some \$18 billion, and the farmers' income was \$11.5 billion. It was necessary to give the farmers confidence. We did that by guaranteeing a floor under his prices, so he knows he will not have prices on wheat or cotton or dairy products or corn reduced, and therefore he can have confidence in the future of his farm production.

I am confident those resolutions urging the acceleration of public works will be adopted by the House. I am quite sure 400,000 or 500,000 additional jobs will be created thereby. Added to the 750,000 in housing, added to the four or five or six hundred thousand from the road bill, and the bill which will give the farmers confidence, I believe we have made a great step forward to face up to the decline in employment the Nation has suffered.

Today the Senate will be presented with a measure based upon the meritorious concept of helping local governments speed up public works. Soon, I hope we will be able to consider on the floor a capital credit bill for small business.

I hope the Congress will give consideration to the problem of increasing old-age assistance benefits, improving social security, extending the time for which unemployment compensation may be paid, and reducing taxes, and will send us a bill, perhaps in one package, upon which the Senate can act.

I have made this statement this morning because it is very vivid in my memory what we went through in the early 1930's. I know it is much cheaper to prevent a depression than to get out of one.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am sure both the administration and the Congress are mindful of the economic problems confronting the Nation. I believe that the 170 million people of our country expect the Congress to move ahead, with due deliberation, in the consideration of important legislation pending before it.

The distinguished majority leader has mentioned that last week the Senate passed the housing bill by an overwhelming vote, and a bipartisan vote, and that other proposed legislation will be coming before the Senate in the weeks ahead.

I believe that such measures should receive reasonable and adequate consideration in committee. I am sure American citizens feel they should have an opportunity to be heard if they desire such an opportunity. There should certainly be a reasonable time for minority views to be prepared, whether such views come from the other side of the aisle or this side of the aisle. It is only in the dictatorships of the world that legislation "whizzes" through without the opportunity for minority views to be heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Now I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to associate myself with the statement the Senator has made as to the desirability of adequate hearings and thorough consideration of all legislative measures, and to point out that it is my information that the road bill was reported from the committee unanimously. In that committee there was a difference on only one point, and that was the billboard matter. It seems to me, and I hope the Senator will agree, that a difference on the billboard section of the bill could be expressed in less than 10 days, in a period when we are trying to provide

five or six hundred thousand men with jobs as soon as action can be taken.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator knows I have cooperated in facilitating the passage of proposed legislation through this body.

I expect to continue to do so. Both the distinguished Senator from Texas and I have been mindful that even though we find we do not always agree with the minority views on either side of the aisle, in our representative form of government the minority has the right to present its views, whether we agree with them or not. We certainly hope the bill will be facilitated. I am sorry there has been necessity for delay. With the implementation presently going on, if the bill be reported by next Monday, the Senate can then consider it. I am sure we shall be able to act on it in the 2 weeks remaining before the Easter recess; and I think we shall have made a very fine record. Of course, if its consideration can be facilitated and it can be passed earlier than that, that would be fine.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want the Senator to know the minority I am speaking of is not the Republican minority. It is a bipartisan minority. It happens to be a divided minority on the billboard section of the bill. I hope my reference to the minority did not prompt the Senator to feel I was being more critical of Members on his side of the aisle than mine. Weeks of hearings have been held on the bill. We are told certain Senators have necessarily to be out of town, and they are going to get around to writing minority views on the billboard question in the latter part of the week. I do not criticize them for it. I merely point out the fact that the schedule this week will have to be adjusted. I hope I will have the Senator's cooperation in having the Senate meet earlier.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator always has my cooperation in having the Senate meet earlier and sit to a later hour. In view of the fact that we have used the terms "majority" and "minority" rather loosely, the Senator from Texas and I understand that majority and minority fluctuate from time to time. Sometimes the majority leader finds himself, as I have in the past, the leader of a minority, and the minority leader finds himself the leader of a majority. I wanted the RECORD to be clear that the minority the Senator was speaking of did not refer to Members on this side of the aisle in toto, but to a minority of the committee itself, and that the bill itself had been reported by a unanimous vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I made some remarks on the recession, on the necessity for our acceleration of public works; and on certain action the Senate took last week, which I considered to be very productive.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following those remarks, a letter to the editor of the New York Times, written by Edward K. Smith, of the department of economics, Boston University. The letter was dated at Chestnut Hill, Mass., on March 13,

1958, and was published in today's issue of the New York Times. I have read Mr. Smith's letter with great interest and stimulation. I believe he expresses in it many sound suggestions. I do not embrace all of the letter; but I hope each Member of the Senate will have an opportunity to read it, to digest it, and to consider it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO AID ECONOMY: CUT IN TAXES DEEMED THE BEST AND QUICKEST METHOD

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The still deepening recession is rapidly confirming the opinion that several economists advanced months ago; viz, the predicted downturn of midyear 1957 would not be corrected, in the absence of substantial intervention, at the earliest until late 1958.

This view did not anticipate sputniks but it did assume more prompt action upon the part of Federal Reserve authorities than did in fact materialize. Both have come too late, in a sense, to do much good in the short run.

The overall optimism about the long-run performance of the American economy has served to alleviate fears of short-run recessions seriously impairing our long-run ability to provide for a growing economy. But there is a distinct possibility that the present recession may engender a cumulative wave of pessimism contributing not only to the deepening and widening of the present downturn but also to doubts about the long-run prospects of the economy itself, even in the face of facts to the contrary.

TIME TO ACT

If this be the case, then the time to act is now and in a positive and forthright manner. A large and complex economy cannot be talked out of recession. It is far easier to keep a boom going than to banish recessions with an outpouring of optimistic views not grounded on fact.

The increased spending on defense and public works, especially the latter, has too long a lag built into it to be an efficient anti-recessionary device. Public works are better suited to conditions of fairly severe depressions. They cannot be easily turned off if recovery is rapid and in many cases cannot be turned off at all. They tend to become built into the structure of things and invoke much more governmental control. Their inflexibility thus seriously impairs their ability to be timed to the kind of cycle we have experienced in the postwar period.

The best measure to take, in the present case, is to cut taxes—and not to cut them on present income, where the benefits do not accrue to the unemployed and come only in dribbles to the great majority of those still working—but to cut them on past income. This can be easily accomplished, for example, by allowing every taxpayer an additional \$100 to \$200 per exemption on his 1957 income tax due April 15. Some \$3 billion to \$6 billion could be pumped into the economy within 4 months under such a plan.

On the corporate-tax side a percentage reduction in total tax liability might be granted, again on the previous income year, perhaps with business in the first income bracket allowed a larger percentage reduction than those in the 52-percent bracket.

MANY ADVANTAGES

The advantages of this method are many. The tax cuts would be based on income already earned, and in most cases on taxes already paid out. Quick processing of tax returns would result in lump-sum payments of refunds available for immediate spending. It would reduce or eliminate payments to be made this April in the case of many thousands of other taxpayers. It would pro-

vide income for those who were working part or all of 1957 but not now. The lump-sum payments can have a far more stimulating effect than the very small increases in disposable income under other plans.

This is a one-shot affair and it does not tinker with tax rates and other provisions of the law, a process better left to careful evaluation in the longer run. And the action is a positive and forthright move to stem recession, worthy of a Government convinced of the long-run viability of the American economy.

The recession once cured, we may turn toward working out these adjustments necessary to our longer run stability, and not have to take the chance of the present kind of "readjustments" or "shakeout" leading to confusion and cumulative breakdown too serious to be turned about by the mechanism advocated above.

The public awaits the April 15 deadline and the Congress should act now.

EDWARD K. SMITH,

Department of Economics, Boston College.
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS., March 12, 1958.

LAUNCHING AND PLACING OF VANGUARD IN ORBIT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am pleased to state at this session of the Senate that the Vanguard has been successfully launched and is in its orbit. All of us are familiar with what must have been some frustrating experiences of those charged with the responsibility, and, undoubtedly, many of us understand what some of the problems were. I think we shall want certainly without regard to partisanship to compliment the Navy, the fine group of organizations, and the other services that cooperated in the common effort. We think those who took part in the effort perhaps had the luck of the Irish, on this St. Patrick's Day, getting the satellite into orbit.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I desire to join with the minority leader in expressing my gratification—indeed, my elation—at the success of the Navy in launching the Vanguard with its satellite, which is now in orbit. This is a reward of patience and of great ingenuity and courage on the part of the Navy. I certainly want to join the Senator from California, in congratulating the Navy upon this splendid achievement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to ask the privilege of associating myself with the statements of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] with regard to the successful launching of the Vanguard. I commend both Senators for their very great interest and more than usual activity with relation to the defense of the Nation, as well as for their patriotism. No member of the Committee on Armed Services has contributed more to our successful hearings, which lasted more than 3 months, than the Senator from Connecticut. I should like to recognize that fact and point it up

at this time, and, at the same time, express my great pride in our Government for its most recent success, even though it is simply one of a series of successes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am honored to have the majority leader express his approval in associating himself with my remarks on this subject. I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Texas for his generous comments concerning my services with him on the Committee on Armed Services.

NAVY SATELLITE SUCCESS SERVES AS REMINDER OF NEED FOR ADMIRAL BYRD ANTARCTIC COMMISSION—NAVAL LEADERSHIP IN EXPLORATION CITED

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join in endorsing the fine statements made in relation to the launching of the Vanguard by the Navy. It is a welcome sign of the United States Navy's continuing leadership in the exploration of the unknown.

Throughout the history of our Nation the Navy has been among the pioneers in breaking through barriers to man's knowledge of his environment. Ships of our fleet have plowed through waters of the Seven Seas, discovering and charting unknown areas of our globe. Scientists from the naval observatories have helped to push back the limitation of man's knowledge of the universe—charting the heavens, laying the groundwork for today's outstanding achievement and for tomorrow's adventure of manned exploration of outer space.

Another area where the Navy has contributed significantly to man's knowledge of his early environment is in Antarctica. For many years the Navy has had the task of finding out about this vast unknown area.

Under the leadership of such outstanding Americans as Adm. Richard E. Byrd and Adm. George Dufek, the Navy has given our Nation a position of world leadership in knowledge of this, the last unknown area of the earth's surface.

Within the past few months, however, other nations, including Russia, have begun to take an active interest in the Antarctic Continent. As a part of the International Geophysical Year, many countries are conducting scientific studies of this area. During this period many other agencies of our Government have joined the Navy in conducting research programs in Antarctica. These programs, although they will lead to further knowledge of this area, are lacking in two essential factors, namely, coordinated leadership and programing for the future. Our present Antarctic program is contributing greatly to man's knowledge. Our program for the future must continue this pattern.

Last year, along with 22 of my fellow Senators, I sponsored a bill, S. 2189, calling for the creation of the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission. The purpose of this Commission would be to coordinate all activities of our Government in this area under one Government agency. A companion bill was introduced in the House of Representatives.

Today the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House is holding a hearing on the measure. This comes as welcome news to all of us who recog-

nize the need for immediate action on this measure. I urge members of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, to which the Senate bill was referred, to follow the excellent example of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in holding hearings on this important proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I submitted to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during today's hearing be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY SAYS ATOM BOMB BLASTS MAY PROVIDE KEY TO SECRETS OF MINERAL WEALTH IN ANTARCTICA—URGES CREATION OF RICHARD E. BYRD ANTARCTIC COMMISSION

(Statement by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY to be included in the record of hearings before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on H. R. 7869, Monday, March 17, 1958)

I regret that I am unable to attend this hearing personally so as to give my views on this bill, H. R. 7869, providing for the creation of the Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission to protect and preserve American rights in Antarctica. Unfortunately a conflicting commitment precludes my attendance. However, I appreciate the opportunity afforded me to present my views.

As you know, I am sponsor along with 22 other Senators of the Senate version of this legislation, S. 2189. I consider this legislation to be one of the most important bills to be considered by Congress in many years.

With every passing day, the need for this type of an Antarctic Commission becomes more and more evident. We continually read in the newspapers and magazines about Russian scientific advances in Antarctica. We know that Russia has definite plans for future development of this vast continent.

Very recently, the Government of Great Britain recommended that a 10-nation commission be formed to govern all future activities on the Antarctic Continent. The Governments of Argentina, Chile, Australia, and New Zealand have all asserted territorial claims in Antarctica.

Last November, Lawrence Gould, United States Chairman of the Antarctic Committee of the International Geophysical Year announced that the United States was going to maintain some permanent bases in Antarctica. This was a step in the right direction. But, it was only a step. There is great need for a continued program of coordinated activities on the part of the United States in this area. I think the time is long overdue for the United States to formulate—and announce to the rest of the world—a concrete policy with regard to its plans for the future of Antarctica.

In the first place, it is the United States which has contributed the overwhelming share of sacrifices in manpower, time, energy, and money for exploration of this so-called unknown continent.

The United States has done more work in Antarctica than the rest of the entire world combined. For us to be silent about our rights or by default arbitrarily give up our prerogatives in this area without first, at least, crystallizing our national policy on the highest level would be an absurd waste of our assets and indifference to our obligations.

There are many who feel that we should not bother with Antarctica because we don't know whether or not it is of any value. I think that these views show a lack of realistic thinking on the part of their proponents.

In the first place, the very fact that we don't know what is in Antarctica makes it

even more imperative for us to maintain our rights and privileges on the continent. There is strong evidence of vast deposits of mineral wealth in this territory. These minerals might well prove the salvation of our Nation in the not too far distant future. Thus far, for example, more than 178 different metal ores have been detected in the mountains of the continent.

NUCLEAR EXPLORATION OF UNKNOWN ASSETS

We may well now be in a position to begin to determine just exactly what the Antarctic Continent holds.

Only last week the Atomic Energy Commission revealed the results of studies of underground nuclear explosions. According to the reports from the AEC, future underground atomic blasts may well be able to tell us exactly what mineral material lies beneath the surface of the earth.

By using atom bomb blasts, which, by the way, seem completely safe from radioactive fallout when exploded underground, we may be able to determine positively where the greatest mineral wealth in the Antarctic Continent lies. Nuclear power may also provide the key to harvesting the mineral wealth from beneath the ice. Are we going to give up our rights to this possible treasure chest of mineral wealth virtually the day before we will know what it contains?

Another argument frequently used against the creation of the Commission is that we already have too many Government bureaus and agencies. Some persons feel that the establishment of this Commission would be too costly.

I say that we have too many uncoordinated agencies and bureaus now involved in the Antarctic program. This fact is one of the prime reasons for creating the Commission. There is a desperate need for integrated activity in the future plans and programs of the United States in Antarctica. Many experts from the diverse agencies now involved in Antarctic projects could be released from their present official connections and employed by the Byrd Antarctic Commission. This would achieve the desired result of a unified, coordinated effort without the necessity of adding any new individuals to the Government payrolls.

Virtually the only cost in establishing this Commission would be a modest sum for administrative overhead.

I feel that the question is not whether we can afford to establish this Commission—the prime question is can we afford not to establish the Commission?

There are many other reasonable and sound arguments for the United States formulation of long-range policy in Antarctica:

1. The distance between Antarctica and any point on the continent of North America can be measured in a matter of minutes, in terms of missile flights.

2. In the event of warfare, and the possible destruction of the Panama Canal, anyone controlling the strategic area of the Antarctic Continent could well control all shipping between the eastern and western coasts of the American continents.

3. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in building defenses for the Western Hemisphere by constructing radar bases and antiaircraft and antimissile installations all along the northern borders of our continent. If we do not maintain a firm attitude and preserve our rights in the Antarctic, we will be leaving the door wide open to the possibility in the event of war, of Russian attack from the southernmost points in our hemisphere. This needless vulnerability, of course, would be sheer folly.

NEED PERMANENT AGENCY NOW

The end of the International Geophysical Year is fast approaching. America must have some positive and concrete long-range pro-

gram of action prior to the end of this great scientific experiment. It is imperative that our policies be clearly defined in order that other nations, as well as our own Government agencies and commissions know just exactly how we stand with regard to this vital area.

I want to make it clear that I am not against international cooperation in Antarctica.

I do not want America to claim more than her due and just share of this unclaimed continent.

On the contrary, I am delighted to have other nations cooperate in a forward thinking program of claim adjudication and scientific development in this area.

However, my major interest—like yours—is the national well-being of the United States.

If the United States does not assert itself in this particular instance, we will be betraying the memory of brave men such as Adm. Richard E. Byrd and others who have worn the uniform of our country and who have devoted much of their lives to exploring the Antarctic Continent.

We must immediately plan a permanent program for the United States in Antarctica. That means more than a few permanent bases. It means a broad scale program.

We must let the rest of the nations interested in Antarctica know our position. We must respectfully but firmly assert our prerogative with regard to this area.

We do not want Russia, or any other nation, for that matter, to have the privilege of casting a veto in an international commission on Antarctica. If it can possibly be avoided, we do not want any nation building submarine or missile bases in strategic areas of this continent which could interfere with the security of our Nation. We do not want other nations to acquire the rights to possible great mineral wealth that Americans have explored and developed.

Furthermore, we want to have the privilege of exploration of the mineral wealth of the continent, by means of the new underground nuclear blast methods, or any other method which can successfully detect what lies beneath the ice-encrusted surface.

This is a matter for every thinking American to take into immediate consideration. It is a subject vital to the actual security of our Nation.

The present spasmodic and uncoordinated activities of many of our Government agencies in Antarctica must be brought under the direction of one central organizational body.

There must be sound, continuous planning, organization, and forethought which goes into our future program with regard to future development of this continent. The decision made by this committee and by the Congress will without doubt, vitally affect the future of our Nation, possibly as much as the decision taken by preceding Congresses with regard to Alaska, the Louisiana Territory and other territorial acquisitions by our Nation.

I urge that this committee give favorable consideration to the bill on the Antarctic Commission, and that this consideration be given immediately, in order that Congress may have an opportunity to act upon this measure. The Byrd Antarctica Commission should become an integral part of the Government organization in the very near future in order that we may be ready when the IGY terminates in December.

Thank you again for giving me the opportunity to present my views.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now in order.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 1140. An act to amend Public Law 85-56 to permit persons receiving retired pay for nonregular service to waive receipt of a portion of that pay to receive pensions or compensation under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration (Rept. No. 1392).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 5382. An act to amend sections 102, 301, and 302 of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act (Rept. No. 1393).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

John G. Kissane, of Vermont, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.;

Anne A. Mitchell, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport Conn.;

Harold R. Becker, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y.;

Josiah A. Maulsby, Sr., of North Carolina, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 15, with headquarters at Wilmington, N. C.; and

Jessie Dixon Saylor, of Georgia, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 17, with headquarters at Savannah, Ga.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOBLITZELL:

S. 3495. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of John Brown's raid at Harpers Ferry; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3496. A bill to provide for the beneficiation of certain low-grade manganese ores purchased by the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. LONG, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 3497. A bill to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3498. A bill to include the holders of star route and certain other contracts for the carrying of mail under the provisions of

the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 3499. A bill to amend the vessel admeasurement laws relating to water ballast spaces; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 3500. A bill to require the full and fair disclosure of certain information in connection with the distribution of new automobiles in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIER:

S. 3501. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to expend funds appropriated for the diversion of surplus farm commodities to provide balanced diets in schools and institutions and for needy families; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 3502. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3503. A bill for the relief of Marie Inette Konomos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 3504. A bill to increase the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the programs of maternal and child health services and services for crippled children provided for by title V of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

BENEFICIATION OF CERTAIN LOW-GRADE MANGANESE ORES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the beneficiation of certain low-grade manganese ores purchased by the General Services Administration. My colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], is co-sponsor of the bill and Representatives METCALF and ANDERSON are introducing companion bills in the House today.

Mr. President, bills for this purpose have been introduced in the Senate and the House by me and others as far back as 1953. Most of these bills, however, asked for extension and enlargement of both the low-grade and car-lot manganese programs and establishment of additional low-grade manganese ore purchase depots, as well as authorization to up-grade to specification material the low-grade ores. These bills met with uniform disapproval by the agencies involved in the minerals programs, as well as by the Bureau of the Budget, so none of them moved out of committee.

The manganese purchase depot serving the Butte-Phillipsburg area in Montana is due to shut down about the second or third week in May 1958, as by that time the 6 million units assigned by the Office of Defense Mobilization will have been delivered. Mr. Gordon Gray, Director of ODM, will not extend the program. Neither will he authorize the beneficiation or up-grading of the ore to usable specifications, as we have been urging him to do for some years, although the ore is useless in its present form. The Government, by the time the purchase program is completed, will have an investment of approximately \$8,817,000 in the ore at this Montana depot, and some types of the ores, I am told, are subject to a certain amount of constant deterioration and should be processed with reasonable promptness.

This particular manganese depot is unique in that there is a Government-owned mill, or processing plant, already built on the premises which, handling similar ores, was operated during World War II, and which can be speedily put into operation. Additionally, a pilot plant recently has been in operation, the results from which indicate that satisfactory recoveries can be made of commercial grades of manganese.

Mr. President, as in many other areas of the United States, unemployment is rampant in my State of Montana, and Montanans now working are living under a nightmare of apprehension that they may be next in the queues of the unemployed, awaiting Government handouts. Already more than 14 percent of Montana's covered workers are getting unemployment benefits, though some have exhausted these, and there are 22,000 applicants for work pressing at the doors of the State unemployment offices. A great many of these are lead, zinc, and copper miners. The end of the low-grade manganese program will add to the misery by throwing several hundred more miners out of work.

The passage of the bill which I have just introduced will keep a substantial number of workers in jobs for perhaps a year, by which time it is to be hoped the administration will have devised methods of overcoming the recession.

I and my colleague [Mr. MANSFIELD] trust that this measure will have fast and sympathetic consideration as one way to keep men at work, and at the same time contribute to the production of a useful element for the national defense and the national economy out of ores which otherwise bid fair to be of little value to the country.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3496) to provide for the beneficiation of certain low-grade manganese ores purchased by the General Services Administration, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express myself as being in wholehearted accord with what the senior Senator from Montana, the chairman of the

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has just said.

In the State of Montana we are not faced with what has been called a recession. As the senior Senator from Montana has pointed out, we are faced with a depression. Montana has the shameful distinction of ranking No. 1, on a percentage basis, among the States of the Union in the number of persons drawing unemployment compensation insurance.

The latest figures at my disposal, figures issued by the administration, indicate that for the week ending February 22, 1958, Montana led the list with a percentage of 14.9 percent. This morning I called Mr. Walter Dougherty, financial secretary of Butte Miners Local No. 1, and I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the information I received from him. I asked Mr. Dougherty the number of miners employed in Butte on January 1, 1957. He replied that according to the books, they numbered 5,109. I then asked him how many miners were employed today. The answer was that, on the basis of his latest checkoff, which was on March 8, the number was 1,827. The figure in March of this year was 1,827, as compared with 5,109 in January a year ago.

This means that the miners in the Butte camp now unemployed amount to approximately 63 percent of the total number of miners employed a little over a year ago. This does not take into account the craft unions, which have been hit just as hard.

When commentators and columnists talk about rough spots and craters of distress throughout the country, I would suggest they take a look at Butte, Mont., a one-commodity mining camp, which depends on one product, and note the condition it is in.

Mr. President, it is up to the Government to step in and take a look at this particular situation. It is nothing new. It has been as it is for a long time, as I tried to indicate on occasions on the floor of the Senate, and as I have tried to indicate in correspondence with the President and other individuals downtown, who ought to take a more active interest in the situation that exists, not only in the mining industry, but in the lumber industry of Montana, as well.

Mr. President, I should like at this point also to raise a question with respect to the efficacy of defense spending if it is going to apply solely to research and development in the missile field.

I point out that although we can accelerate the defense spending all we want in the field of missiles, it will not mean much in the way of employment for our people. I also point out that we are not in a position as yet to forego the use of conventional weapons. I most respectfully suggest to the administration that it look into this particular aspect of our security, and that it do something about making certain that our conventional defense setup is as strong and impregnable as it can be; that we have the number of trucks, tanks, rifles, and other means of defending ourselves that we must have, and will not have to rely exclusively on the weapons of what many call the war

of the future, a war to be based on missile and rocket developments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter I wrote to the President of the United States, dated September 5, 1957; a letter written to the President by the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and me dated February 11, 1958; a letter written to the State Board of Examiners of Montana by my colleague, Representative METCALF, and me on February 12, 1958; a letter from Mr. Gordon Gray dated April 19, 1957; a letter written by me to more than 6,000 petitioners of Butte, Silver Bow County, Mont., dated February 21, 1958, relative to the manganese plant and its activation; a letter I wrote to the President of the United States on February 21, 1958; a reply I received, not from the President, but from Mr. I. Jack Martin, Administrative Assistant to the President, dated March 12, 1958, in which Mr. Martin enclosed a copy of a letter to Mr. Frank Murray, secretary of state of Montana, which the Montana delegation had sent him weeks ago, and a copy of a press release issued by the White House and addressed to the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and Representative JOSEPH MARTIN, dated March 8, 1958, relative to what the administration proposed to do in the field of employment.

So far as concerns the specific question raised about the manganese plant in Montana and its use, and what will be done by the administration concerning the production of lead, copper, and zinc, and other matters mentioned in the letter to the President, no answer from him, was received. The letter sent to President Eisenhower was worthy enough, in my opinion, to have been brought to his personal attention because, I repeat, so far as Montana is concerned, and especially so far as Silver Bow County and Butte are concerned, they are not in a recession; they are in a depression. We think the administration should step in and give us some help in a legitimate manner.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
September 5, 1957.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I respectfully direct your immediate attention to the depressed economic conditions existing in the Nation's domestic lead and zinc industry.

The lead and zinc industry contributes significantly to the economy and defense of this country, and specifically to some 27 States. The value of this industry, including mines, smelters, and refineries in the United States is approximately \$1 billion.

Domestic production of lead and zinc has not kept pace with increased world production because our miners cannot compete with foreign labor, and the United States is being flooded with foreign imports of both lead and zinc. The impact of these imports in recent months has been tremendous. In my State of Montana, one of the largest zinc-producing States, the number of miners

engaged in bringing zinc out of the ground has dropped over 1,500 men in the last several months. This is not an isolated instance.

I had hoped that relief legislation would be enacted during the very recent session of the 85th Congress, but final action was not taken by either the Senate or the House of Representatives. Testimony presented in public Congressional hearings by both your representatives and those of the Department of the Interior have supported the need for relief for the domestic lead and zinc industry.

I have given considerable time and thought to this situation, and I feel that perhaps the dominant reason for the inability to obtain Congressional action was that many of my colleagues felt that relief legislation was not necessary since you, as the President of the United States, already have the authority to afford relief to the domestic lead and zinc industry from import competition. This authority was previously delegated to you by the Congress in trade-agreements legislation.

The authority you have is broad and general and applies to all industries which are injured or threatened with injury as a result of trade-agreement concessions. If not, the Congress has not been advised that your existing authority, under the escape clause and the national-security amendment, is inadequate in these matters.

It is clear that you have not made use of existing administrative procedures which are available to you to provide the necessary relief for this industry. I strongly urge that you do so, without delay.

The economy of our Nation is a metals economy. Our industrial life is based upon and is dependent upon a plentiful supply of raw materials demanded by our economy in times of peace and war. The best insurance for such a plentiful supply is keeping intact our domestic minerals production, thus insuring an adequate economic and mobilization base.

Again, I want to impress upon you the urgency of this matter, and ask that you personally review this situation, utilizing existing authority to bring relief to the domestic lead and zinc industry.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

FEBRUARY 11, 1958.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Undoubtedly you are conversant with the very serious plight of our copper industry. The price of copper has plummeted from 55 cents a pound in April 1956 to a current market price of 25 cents a pound—a price which will not permit the economic operation of a large portion of the United States industry. For several months the copper market has been in a condition of glut and production exceeded consumption last year nearly 300,000 tons.

We would call to your attention the following facts concerning this vital industry:

1. Copper is an irreplaceable strategic raw material.
2. For national security reasons during the Korean crisis the Federal Government underwrote the development of new ore bodies, and most reliable current estimates are that projects developed under the Defense Production Act have added more than 250,000 tons to the annual American production. (In other words, the expanded capacity sponsored by the Government is almost equivalent to the surplus production which has depressed prices to their present level.)
3. American copper producers are mining the lowest grade ore, and paying the highest wages in the world today. (Their competitive disadvantage is indicated by the fact that the average hourly wage of the United

States copper miner is more than 50 percent of the total daily wage paid by foreign producers.)

We also wish to point out that the American copper industry has, by its own volition, asked to have the copper tariff suspended in past years and has operated under a free market since the end of World War II except for a brief period of 4 months. The industry has turned to the Federal Government for assistance now only as a last resort measure to prevent economic disaster.

We consider it highly significant that the copper people are not demanding protection of a permanent high tariff. The legislation we, and other colleagues, have introduced (S. 2998 and companion House bills) contemplates a new floor and import tax which will tend to balance out competition between the foreign and domestic producer until such time as the influence of expanding markets will permit a return to normal operations.

We are not requesting at this time that you take steps to restrict imports of foreign copper, as by law Congress has suspended the import tax on copper until June 30 of this year. However, it is plain that major shutdowns will probably occur unless special legislation is enacted soon to provide temporary relief. (Nor does the industry feel that it has an adequate remedy before the Tariff Commission. All available evidence indicates that it would take more than a year to present a case and get a ruling on this problem.)

Although Members of Congress from copper producing areas have formed a united front, we are convinced that we cannot succeed unless strong executive leadership is forthcoming in support of our legislation. We urge you to throw the full weight of your office behind this legislation in order that the Nation may maintain a healthy and vigorous copper industry as an integral part of its national defense effort.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senator.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 14, 1958.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: On behalf of the President, I am pleased to acknowledge your and Senator MURRAY's February 11 letter respecting legislation for the relief of the copper industry, and to assure you that a further reply will be forthcoming at an early date.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

I. JACK MARTIN,
Administrative Assistant
to the President.

FEBRUARY 12, 1958.

STATE BOARD OF EXAMINERS,
Helena, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: Your letter of January 30, 1958, addressed to the Montana Congressional Delegation is at hand.

You probably are aware that we have been working with the Office of Defense Mobilization and the General Services Administration for several years: (1) To get an extension of the low-grade manganese program; and (2) to arrange for the beneficiation of the present GSA stockpile at Butte and Phillipsburg.

There seems to be some misunderstanding about the milling deduction from payments to the shippers. The deduction was for the purpose of computing payments on deliveries, as with deductions for grade and for impurities and there never was a fund established into which these deductions were paid. At the time the program was set up

the Government felt a shortage of manganese might develop and these low-grade ores would have to be beneficiated. This condition did not develop. The Office of Defense Mobilization would have to authorize the General Services Administration to borrow Defense Production Act funds for milling these ores. ODM does not feel this action is warranted as the national defense manganese stockpile requirements are now fulfilled. This fact, aside from the expense involved, also is responsible for the failure of your delegation to get an extension of the low-grade manganese program, either by Executive order or by act of the Congress.

The report of the Special Stockpile Advisory Committee made to ODM Director Gordon Gray, entitled "Stockpiling for Defense in the Nuclear Age" recommends upgrading stockpiled materials to the ultimate usable form but only when the equivalent material cannot be purchased cheaper on the open market. The precise language states that subspecification material "should be up-graded when this can be accomplished at less cost than buying new material." An extensive correspondence with the General Services Administration indicates that the Butte-Phillipsburg stockpile does not fulfill this recommendation.

While your Congressional Delegation is acutely aware of the present unemployment situation and is anxious to alleviate it, ODM Director Gray has long taken the attitude, as did Director Flemming before him, that he is helpless to exercise his Defense Production Act authority for purely economic purposes where the project is one not directly required for national defense or essential for stockpiling.

This puts the matter squarely in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, who has no money for the purpose and who has consistently opposed legislation aimed at extending the low-grade program and providing for beneficiation plants at the various low-grade manganese depots.

It is not a question of the feasibility of treating the stockpile. In spite of all our urging the Administration simply will not approve the project, administratively or legislatively. We shall, however, not relax our efforts to try and get something done.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senator.
LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1957.

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and
Insular Affairs, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have your letter of April 2 transmitting a petition signed by the manganese producers in the Butte and Phillipsburg, Mont., mining districts urging that the Government-owned manganese concentrating facilities and the nodulizing plant of the Domestic Manganese and Development Company at Butte be placed in operation at once to beneficiate and nodulize the low-grade manganese ores acquired under the low-grade purchase program at Butte to meet specifications for manganese sold to the Government under the carlot manganese purchase program. Your letter requests our comments on the petition.

At the time this domestic support program was established, the United States was faced with the possibility of all-out war and very limited reserves of metallurgical manganese. Emergency efforts, therefore, were directed toward developing domestic and other accessible sources of usable grades of manganese.

At present, however, Government-held inventories of specification-grade metallurgical manganese are far in excess of the minimum stockpile objective, and quantities on hand and on order are almost equal to the long-term objective. Thus we have on hand and on order sufficient specification-grade metallurgical manganese to meet any foreseeable national emergency.

There is thus no immediate urgency to utilize the low-grade material now in Government stocks and accruing under the domestic low-grade manganese support program. The material, of course, could serve as a reserve beyond the ample amounts of specification-grade material on hand and on order should unforeseen developments indicate a need for upgrading it to usable form.

In view of the foregoing, it is concluded that the defense justification cannot presently be established for the beneficiation program as requested in the petition.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON GRAY,
Director.

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE
ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,
February 21, 1958.

To the 6,000 petitioners of Butte, Silver Bow County, Mont.:

This will acknowledge receipt of your petition relative to the use of the domestic manganese plant in Butte.

I want to assure you of my great interest in this matter and my desire to be of all possible assistance. To date the reports which Senator MURRAY and I have received from Gordon Gray, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and others, have not been too encouraging. I am very much concerned, though, about the economic situation in Butte and having worked in the mines myself for 10 years, Butte is close to my heart, and I want to do everything I possibly can to be of assistance. I am, therefore, once again taking up the matter with Mr. Gray and other officials downtown and while I cannot promise anything definite, you may rest assured I will do all in my power to be of assistance to help alleviate the situation in Butte and Montana.

I am enclosing for your consideration the latest report from Mr. Gray and also a letter which Senator MURRAY and I sent to the President on the copper situation, together with the reply from the White House. As you know, Senator MURRAY and I have introduced a bill, S. 2998, seeking to set a floor of 30 cents a pound on copper imported from abroad. We have also introduced a bill to impose a tariff on lead and zinc, S. 2271. This matter is now also before the Tariff Commission for consideration.

I have also written a letter to the Secretary of Labor to declare Butte a distressed area so that it will be possible for defense contracts and other Federal works which may be proposed to be diverted to Butte.

The whole delegation has been very active, and I am also enclosing a copy of our last communication to Governor Aronson urging that he join with us in making arrangements for the distribution of surplus foods to areas like Butte where unemployment is bad and the need for this type of assistance necessary.

Must close now, but again assuring you of my interest in the situation in Butte and my desire to be of all possible assistance, I am

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

P.S.: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I am directing to the President of the United States asking for his personal assistance in the manganese matter.

Regards,

M. M.

FEBRUARY 21, 1958.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am in receipt of a petition signed by over 6,000 residents of Butte and the State of Montana seeking immediate aid for the activation of the mill of the Domestic Manganese and Development Co. in Butte, Mont. At that mill there are approximately 350,000 tons of manganese ore purchased by the Federal Government. The Federal Government has deducted from the shippers of manganese the sum of \$16.60 per ton to process the ore. As stated in the manganese regulations, this mill charge is to be applied to process low-grade ores. It is my belief that such money should be applied to process low-grade ores which are worthless in their present form, because this money was intended for this purpose.

The Government-owned domestic manganese mill represents an investment of approximately \$2 million and can be activated in 1 or 2 months. It is my understanding that the low-grade manganese program will terminate on July 1, 1958. If this should happen, it would mean that all small manganese producers in Butte, Phillipsburg, and the State of Montana would be forced to cease operations and, furthermore, that the domestic manganese company would be compelled to discharge its present working force. The total effect, if this were to happen, would be between 300 to 400 men now working in the Montana manganese industry. It is my belief and the belief of the people of Montana that the \$16.60 per ton deducted to process this ore, with the mill available and ready for immediate production at Butte, that the immediate preparation for the activation of this facility would be of prime importance in avoiding additional unemployment which has already created a serious problem in Butte. Activation of the mill will enable small miners to continue operating their properties, will create new employment, and will, therefore, enhance Silver Bow's depressed economy.

May I point out, Mr. President, that on the basis of the latest figures I have, that 21,500 Montanans are, as of February 14, seeking employment—according to the figures of the Unemployment Compensation Commission of the State of Montana. This means that upwards of 90,000 Montana citizens are today feeling the effects of reduced earnings because of mounting unemployment in my State. As of January 18, on the basis of insured unemployment figures compiled by the Bureau of Employment Security of the United States Department of Labor, Montana ranked second to Oregon with a percentage of 12.3, compared to Oregon's 12.8. As of now it would be my belief that due to the continued depressed conditions, that we would very likely have the dubious honor of leading all the States in the Nation on an insured unemployment basis.

I cannot impress upon you too strongly the extremely difficult situation which exists in my State. As one who worked in the mines of Butte for 10 years as a mucker and miner, I am deeply aware and conscious of the situation as it exists in my old home town. I believe that the time for action in helping the people of Butte and Montana is now and not in the future and I, therefore, most urgently and most respectfully request that you give your personal attention to the request and the petition of my people for aid and assistance in activating the Domestic Manganese and Development Co. mill in Butte; that you urge the Tariff Commission to reach a decision and make known its findings on the question of lead and zinc which has been before them since last November; and that you as the President of the United States give your personal attention in support of the bill, S. 2998, intro-

duced by Senator MURRAY and me to put a new floor of 30 cents a pound under copper and to impose an excise tax which will tend to balance our competition between the foreign and domestic producers.

The State of Montana is convinced that strong executive leadership is necessary if the depressed and downtrodden mining industry, which means so much to the people of our State and our country, is to be given the consideration, the protection, and assurance which it deserves. May I personally express to you the gravity of this situation and urge that you do all you can to help us at your very earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 12, 1958.
The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: This is in further reply to your letter of February 21 concerning the problems of the Montana producers of copper, lead, zinc, and manganese.

You know, I am sure, of the President's deep concern for those families experiencing the hardship of shortened working time or temporary unemployment. It is because of this concern for the welfare of all Americans that he has emphasized the importance of taking the proper steps to promote the renewed expansion of job opportunities. In this connection, many steps have already been taken or proposed to the Congress and others are being considered. Moreover, the President's statements of February 12 and March 8, copies of which are enclosed, clearly express his determination to pursue every measure that might become appropriate as the economic situation develops.

With respect to S. 2998 relating to copper imports, the executive branch study of this measure is under way and the reports will be forwarded to the appropriate committees at an early date.

The President also shares your interest in the problems facing the producers of lead and zinc. You will recall that last August, in a letter to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the President reaffirmed his interest in the long-range minerals program. The administration program included proposals for sliding scale import taxes designed to moderate lead and zinc imports. When the Congress did not enact these proposals, the lead and zinc industry filed the escape clause application to which your letter refers. On the following day, the President requested the Tariff Commission, by a letter to its chairman, to expedite these proceedings and was assured that the matter would move ahead as speedily as possible.

I need hardly say, therefore, that the President is greatly concerned over the welfare of our lead and zinc producers. He has made this clear through the administration's legislative proposals, in his August letter, and by his efforts to expedite the consideration of the industry's escape clause application.

With respect to the Domestic Manganese and Development Co., you know, of course, that the reactivation of this plant as urged in your letter is a question with which the Office of Defense Mobilization is primarily concerned. I have been in touch with the Director of that Office and understand that the defense needs for metallurgical manganese have been fully met. Since, moreover, the Government is fulfilling its obligation under the purchase program, there are no grounds for using defense funds to reactivate the processing plant as proposed. That reactivation would require appropriations and authority that are not now available. You may be interested in seeing the reply of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobiliza-

tion to the Montana secretary of state on this matter. I am glad to enclose a copy.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

I. JACK MARTIN,

Administrative Assistant to the President.

DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION IN CONNECTION WITH DISTRIBUTION OF NEW AUTOMOBILES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require labels on automobiles, spelling out such things as freight charges, method of shipment and the retail price suggested by factories to dealers.

The bill would thus require automobile manufacturers to make public their suggested retail prices on new cars rather than keeping these prices secret.

It would not remove the opportunity for retailer and purchaser to engage in that great American sport of bargaining over prices of both the new car and the trade-in. But it would arm the presently bewildered car buyer with some necessary facts, and would do away with the advantage held now by a few unscrupulous dealers. Presently the dealer who is honest about the so-called list price cannot compete with the one who "picks" several hundred dollars extra into it so he can pretend to give more on the trade-in.

This proposal would remove the secrecy about a new car's price by a public label. Other facts of importance to the consumer would provide immediate improvement to the car market by helping to restore public confidence in car selling practices.

At present, how does one find out what a car costs? It is simply fantastic that the most wanted product in the world should have become a hydromatic pea in a Madison Avenue shell game. We can find out about hydromatics, mercomatics, dynaflo, torsion bar suspension, seat lifts with a memory, and even dual and triple jet fuel injection, but the one simple fact we really want to know—how much does the darn thing cost—we cannot find out at all.

The proposed label would include the name, make, model, serial number, freight charge, final assembly point, method by which the car had been transported, and the dealer to whom shipped, as well as price.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3500) to require the full and fair disclosure of certain information in connection with the distribution of new automobiles in commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. THURMOND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague, who is a member of the Subcommittee on Automobile Mar-

keting Practices of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. PAYNE. My colleague was very kind and courteous to me, as he always is, when he offered me an opportunity to cosponsor this particular piece of proposed legislation. While I am not joining as a cosponsor, as I explained to my colleague from Oklahoma, I feel that the proposal has considerable merit. There are many features of it which I believe should be gone into very carefully by the committee. There certainly is a field which needs to be explored in this regard. I gain that impression not only from my work on the committee, but also from some experience which I have had in the automotive field. While I have not joined as a sponsor, I am very sympathetic to the aims and objectives of the proposed legislation, and certainly will work very closely with my colleague in connection with hearings on the particular bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate the comment of my distinguished colleague from Maine. This is merely a starting point. Hearings will be held, and the bill will be subject to such amendments as the trade and the public may have to suggest.

I think it is peculiar, indeed, that such great institutions as the Ford Motor Co., which spends hundreds of thousands of dollars in advertising through double-page spreads in the Saturday Evening Post to the effect that the new 4-seated Thunderbird can be bought for \$56 a month, will not tell us what the car costs. A few people might want to know what the car costs, perhaps with the idea of paying cash for it rather than buying it on payments extended over 3 years, with the interest almost equaling the price of the car.

The automobiles being manufactured today are the most wanted product which the American people desire; and yet I defy any Member of the Senate or of the public to tell me what the suggested retail price of any of the big three or big four cars is. We can find out only through the \$1,000 trade-ins which are offered, and by deducting the phony "pack" which is so often added.

RETAIL PRICING OF NEW AUTOMOBILES

Mr. MONRONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I introduced a bill which will return the automobile industry to a system of advertised delivered pricing and put suggested retail price tags on new cars.

For almost a score of years as the great automobile industry developed into a major heavy industry it was the custom of the factories to advertise the prices of cars, so that any buyer could clearly know what the suggested or advertised retail price of the car was.

For the past several years, we have seen such advertising, which was so valuable to the public as a gauge to the price of the car, disappear from the colored one-page or double-truck advertisements of the automobile companies. Today practically no major automobile manufacturer and practically

no retailer ever advertises the suggested retail price of the automobile.

For the past several weeks a committee of the Senate has been involved in an inquiry which has raised the question: Are car prices too high?

Numerous witnesses recently appeared before the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee hearing ably chaired by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. Walter Reuther, president of United Auto Workers, says the price of cars ought to be cut \$100. One hundred dollars from what? Harlow Curtice says car prices are not too high. Ford Motor Co. agrees. So do the other manufacturers. Mr. President, these gentlemen did a good job in presenting their own viewpoints about who should get what share of the money that you and I pay for a car. They disagreed mainly on how the money should be divided. Mr. President, I think the public can be excused if their primary concern is in the amount of money they put up in the first place.

How does one find out what a car costs? It is simply fantastic that the most wanted product in the world should have become a hydromatic pea in a Madison Avenue shell game.

The bill I now present would require automobile manufacturers to make public certain things which the purchaser has a right to know in order to make an informed purchase. This would not do away with the great American sport of bargaining over the prices of both the new car and the trade-in, but it would let the customer know where to start.

A label affixed to the windshield would show the name, make, model, and serial number of the car; the assembly plant, the dealership to which delivered; and the method of transportation.

On the label would be stamped the advertised retail price which was suggested by the factory, including the freight charges and the retail price of the attached accessories.

If one walks within 10 feet of the door of an automobile show room, he will get an hour's lecture on the details of hydromatics, mercomatics, dynaflo, powerglides, twin-beam headlamps, torsion bar suspension, torsion air suspension, two- and four-way seat lifts with a memory, dual and triple carburetors, and even jet fuel injection.

One can find out about convertible hardtops, hardtop convertibles that do convert, hardtop convertibles that do not convert, power steering, power brakes, power windows, and a lot about horsepower.

But the one simple fact that he really wants to know—how much does the darn thing cost?—he cannot find out at all. It may help a little if one is an ex-FBI agent charged with vitamin pills, a jet-propelled slide rule, and a library full of blue books, green books, orange books, and red books—assisted by a Ph. D. in mathematics.

Not only is the car buyer unable to determine the factory-advertised price of the car; no one is able to tell him, in advance, how much the finance charges or insurance will be. Indeed, he may

not even see his insurance policy until weeks after he has bought the car.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and I have spent 3 years making the most comprehensive study of automobile marketing that Congress has ever undertaken. We held extensive hearings, and we hoped, as a result of the facts developed, that the industry would find its way out of the oriental bazaar without the necessity of Federal legislation. In that hope we have been gravely disappointed.

Recent editorials in Advertising Age magazine of December 30, 1957, and January 27, 1958, suggest that the traditional American system of honest sales for an honest price has deteriorated into the economic jungle of a Middle East bazaar, in which everything, including price, is a mystery. They reprint a newspaper advertisement offering for a charge of \$5 to supply the prospective car purchaser the services of a car shopper who will get, in writing, 4 competitive quotations from authorized new-car dealers.

Other ads, from the Wall Street Journal of December 13, 1957, offer—for a fee—to supply information as to the automobile dealer's wholesale delivered costs. Thus we have come to the point that one must have a guide through the automobile marketing jungle.

I believe I speak for the public when I say it would be a pleasure to have a price label on cars. I think the people would heave a sigh of relief if they could go to a showroom and see what the advertised selling price is. In fact, much of the current slump in car sales is caused by plain old fear, or perhaps revulsion, on the part of the prospective car buyer. The car market today—with disposable personal income at almost record levels—would be immediately improved if public confidence in car-selling practices could be restored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorials and advertisements be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and advertisements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

[From Advertising Age of December 30, 1957]

THE BIGGEST MARKETING PROBLEM OF 1958

It could be that we are losing our perspective. But the more we think about it, the more we are convinced that the biggest marketing problem in America revolves around the marketing of automobiles.

We don't mean precisely how many will be sold in 1958, either. That is important to the economy—extremely important. But, what is infinitely more important, it seems to us, is how they are sold.

The American economy has evolved, through a couple of centuries, on the basis of trust and confidence; of clearly defined costs and prices; of standardized products available from trustworthy producers and dealers at identifiable prices and under clearly ascertainable terms.

Through the past half century, the automobile industry has been a leader in helping to develop this orderly concept of marketing on the American scene, a concept under which the buyer had less reason to beware than under any other previous set of conditions. And now this self-same automobile

industry has led the way to a breakdown of all these concepts and a return to the economic jungle of a Middle East bazaar, in which everything, including price, is a mystery. Customers are no longer customers in the traditional American sense; they are traders and bargainiers, pitting their puny knowledge and their buying skills against the experts, in a game which is rapidly discarding all semblance of rules.

No one knows any longer how much an automobile costs—any automobile. No one knows what equipment and gadgets belong on an automobile; what items are included in the cost and what items are available on option, at extra cost. No one knows what a trade-in is supposed to be worth. And no one, understandably, believes a word of the retail price advertising of automobiles that appears every day in our newspapers and over our air waves.

With perfectly straight faces, dealers advertise "savings up to \$2,000" on cars that sell, altogether, for \$3,500 or \$3,600; with the utmost contempt for facts and for even the most elementary factors of human decency, they use weasel words and double-talk to snare the unwary buyers, who have no way of knowing what they are supposed to pay.

Whose fault is all this? It all depends, of course, on whom you ask. But one great big step to cut out all the double-dealing could be taken by manufacturers and should be taken by manufacturers. The public has a right to know what new cars are supposed to cost; what is standard equipment and what is not—and the manufacturers have an obligation to tell them. And don't tell us, please, that this can't be done. Approximate prices can be quoted; they have been in the past, and they can be now.

If we don't clear up this enormous area of economic jungle on the marketing scene, we can expect this jungle to encroach further and further on the marketing civilization we have so laboriously hacked out over a couple of centuries. Already the jungle has overrun enormous areas of our marketplace. We can't wait any longer to start beating it back again.

EXHIBIT B

[From Advertising Age of January 27, 1958]

TOOLS FOR AUTOMOTIVE JUNGLE

In the December 30 issue, Advertising Age said editorially that the biggest marketing problem of 1958 is how, rather than how many, automobiles are sold. We said that the marketing of automobiles has now reached a condition approximately like "the economic jungle of a Middle East bazaar, in which everything, including price, is a mystery."

The editorial apparently hit a responsive chord. It has been reprinted by a couple of newspaper financial columnists, and commented upon by several editorial writers. Its appearance has also resulted in a couple of very interesting pieces of mail reaching us, which bear out our original assertion that buying a car now forces Americans to become "traders and bargainiers, pitting their puny knowledge and their skills against the experts." One of these pieces of mail is reproduced here. For \$5 Jadar will get the puzzled buyer four quotations on a car, thus saving the buyer a bit of the slogging from dealer to dealer which otherwise is involved.

The other is a classified ad from a New York paper, in which Auto Costs Publications offers the puzzled auto shopper a book which "gives you the wholesale prices of 1958 cars and equipment," so that the buyer can "get in the driver's seat and save hundreds of dollars" when he buys a new car.

This is utterly and completely ridiculous. What kind of economy do we live in where such tools as these are hopefully offered to shoppers as protection against lack of elemental price knowledge? We suggested originally, and we suggest again, that the public

has a right to know what new cars are supposed to cost, and what is standard equipment and what is not—and that manufacturers have a clear-cut obligation to tell them.

They are not living up to that obligation now, but they ought to be. The public ought to begin a sensibly close approximation of prices on all models and all gadgets, and the ridiculous price advertising and silly wheeling and dealing—much of it based on phony prices to start with—of dealers ought to be stopped, or curtailed.

Letting the public in on the secret of what the cars ought to cost is the logical and most important first step on the road to marketing sanity.

NOW BUY YOUR NEW CAR IN COMPLETE CONFIDENCE

Let us do your shopping for you and secure for you, in writing, four competitive quotations from authorized new car dealers.

Write or call today for more information and the order form.

State your preference on the form and return it back to us. We will then solicit, by mail, four quotes for you on the model of your choice.

Introductory offer fee, \$5.

JADAR QUOT-A-CAR SERVICE.

CHICAGO, ILL.

EXHIBIT C

[From the Wall Street Journal of December 13, 1957]

NINE HUNDRED PERCENT RETURN TO NEW CAR BUYERS ON YOUR \$10 INVESTMENT¹

That's right—investment of \$10 in a copy of Auto Costs will net you at least a 900 percent return. Auto Costs gives you the exact wholesale cost of all new 1958 cars and their equipment. It puts you in the driver's seat when you buy a new car—you can't be fooled—you may save hundreds of dollars. All model and price changes are included free. Send \$10 for a 1 year subscription or only \$18 for an economy 3 year subscription. AUTO COSTS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

NEW CAR BUYERS

Thousands saved money last year. You, too, can protect your pocketbook. Tell us make of car you plan to buy and we'll send you dealer's wholesale prices, including options and accessories, with instructions for figuring a fair deal in your locality. Send \$1 for each make of car.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH.

DETROIT, MICH.

NINE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-FOUR PERCENT PROFIT ON YOUR \$1 INVESTMENT

If you plan to buy a new car, tell us the make and we will send you wholesale prices on all body types, options, and accessories, with instructions for figuring a reasonable retail price including freight, taxes, and a fair markup for the dealer. You may save \$200 or \$300. Many of our customers have. In any case you will have the satisfaction of knowing what sort of a deal you made. With our report in hand you won't have to worry about packed prices and other sharp dealer practices. You can't bargain effectively without accurate price information. If you save only \$10.84 in a car deal, you will have made \$9.84 on your \$1 investment.

Send \$1 for each make of car.

AUTO PRICE REPORTS.

DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

¹ If you save only \$100 in a car deal, you will have made \$90 on your \$10 investment.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank my friend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for his kind reference to me.

It has been an unusual pleasure to work with the Senator from Oklahoma on this important subcommittee. He has worked tirelessly and assiduously. I think the people of the United States should be greatly indebted to him for the magnificent service he has rendered in bringing to light the unsavory marketing practices in the automobile business. I think the achievements of the subcommittee are a great contribution to the public welfare.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague, and fellow committee member, who also is a cosponsor of the bill about which I am speaking. The junior Senator from South Carolina helps to protect the most vital segment of our small-business community. He has fought determinedly for small business.

If we do not make certain ground rules against hitting below the belt in the merchandising of the most desirable product which America produces, a new automobile, then Congress will be guilty of turning its back on one of the last great hopes for the survival of small business.

The unscrupulous operators, in their greater degree of unprincipled activities, could exploit the public into believing that a car which has an advertised factory list price of \$3,000 is really a \$4,500 car, and that by giving the prospective buyer a \$1,000 allowance on the old jalopy, he is getting a bargain, because the legitimate dealer will allow him only \$350.

In other words, by marking up the list price of an automobile to an unrealistic amount—which is done repeatedly by unscrupulous automobile dealers—they are able to offer far more for trade-ins than can be offered by scrupulous dealers who wish to sell new automobiles at honest prices and to allow honest amounts for the old automobiles that are traded in.

But under the system which has developed in the "oriental bazaar," misleading pricing-practice that is engaged in at the present time, the legitimate dealer is penalized, and at the same time the purchaser of the automobile is subjected to deceit and fraud in connection with his purchase.

Mr. President, I have talked to automobile dealers in half the States in the Union, and I have rarely found one who wishes to see such practices continued by the great American automobile industry. This industry has put into the hands of the American people more automobiles than the automobile industry of any other country has ever dreamed of putting in the hands of their people.

The dealers wish to hold their heads high, as self-respecting businessmen who are honest in their advertised words and in their statements.

But the current practice, which a few automobile dealers have forced upon the industry, makes it impossible for the average citizen to know exactly what is the

list price of any of the various models and makes of automobiles.

Mr. President, last December, in order to ascertain just how one finds the retail price of an automobile, a member of the subcommittee staff sent \$1 in answer to one of the advertisements which I have just inserted in the RECORD. In return, he received certain documents, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D INSTRUCTIONS ESTIMATING APPROXIMATE RETAIL PRICE

To the cost at the factory of the appropriate body type and series, add the cost of the accessories and options as shown on the opposite side of this sheet and mark up the total by 30 percent to reflect the full suggested retail margin.

Then list the prices of any special services which you may desire such as undercoating, antifreeze, dealer preparation, or waxing. To this must be added the freight from the main factory location of the make to your city which is approximately \$10 plus 20 cents a mile for the first 150 miles plus 5 cents a mile thereafter, but not more than \$1.25 for Ford, Chevrolet, and Plymouth. The freight goes up in proportion to weight for heavier cars.

To the grand total of the items listed above must be added the local sales tax, if any, and the charge for the license or registration fee and title papers, to arrive at total delivered price. All Federal taxes are included in the cost figures.

A Michigan Business Review study indicated that one customer in six paid more than the suggested delivered retail price as computed above, while about one-third of all customers secured a discount from this price of \$200 or more on low-priced cars.

Dealer cost of 1958 model Lincoln and major accessories

MODEL AND BODY TYPE AND DEALER COST	
Capri series:	
53-A Sedan, 4 door.....	\$3,755
57-A Hardtop, 4 door.....	3,755
63-A Hardtop, 2 door.....	3,645
Premier series:	
53-B Sedan, 4 door.....	4,225
57-B Hardtop, 4 door.....	4,225
63-B Hardtop, 2 door.....	4,035
Continental:	
54-A Sedan, 4 door.....	4,615
75-A Hardtop, 4 door.....	4,615
65-A Hardtop, 2 door.....	4,425
68-A Convertible.....	4,775

ACCESSORIES AND OPTIONS, DEALER COST

Tires:	
Nylon white side walls 9.50 over 9.....	\$64.95
Nylon white side walls 9.50 over 9.50.....	59.05
Rayon white side walls 9.50 over 9.....	42.10
Rayon white side walls 9.50 over 9.50.....	42.10
Air conditioner.....	491.20
Heater and defroster.....	104.00
Electric door locks, 2 door.....	22.35
Electric door locks, 4 door.....	33.85
Electric dimmer.....	38.00
Power lubricator.....	33.00
Power seat, 6 way, Premier and Continental.....	34.70
Power seat, 6 way, Capri.....	81.75
Power vent windows.....	51.00
Power windows, Capri.....	92.40
Radio.....	134.55
F. M. attachment.....	99.00
Front seat speaker.....	8.30
Automatic starter.....	8.30
Chrome curb guard.....	20.65
Directed power differential.....	44.00

Dealer cost of 1958 model Lincoln and major accessories—Continued

ACCESSORIES AND OPTIONS, DEALER COST—CON.	
Front license plate frame.....	\$5.85
Leather trim (std. conv.).....	76.75
Remote control deck lidlock.....	23.10
Seat belts (front seat only).....	18.20
Tinted glass.....	37.15
Transparent sun visors.....	20.65
Wheel covers.....	28.10
Special paint: std. conv.....	30.00
Freight from Novi, Mich.	

Work sheet

Dealer cost at factory:	
Basic charge for body type and series.....	\$.....
Options and accessories (list).....
Subtotal.....
Add 30 percent for suggested dealer markup.....
Freight: (See instructions) (from main factory).....
Special services ¹
Total.....
State and local sales taxes on above total.....
License, registration, and title fees.....
Suggested retail delivered price.....

¹ Special services includes waxing, gas, lubrication, undercoating, etc. These prices are set locally. You can ask dealer for other makes what they charge. In addition, many dealers ask \$25 to \$60 for preparing the car for delivery.

You should beware of phony options and accessories. A few dealers will allow their salesmen to charge customers for options, such as special colors, which the factory actually supplies at no extra cost.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, from an examination of this material—for which \$1 was paid—it is possible to prepare a worksheet with mathematical calculations based on the data supplied; and thus one can finally determine the suggested retail delivered price of a Ford, a Buick, a Chrysler, or a product of the American Motors Corp. or Studebaker-Packard.

Mr. President, in the heyday of the automobile business, the price f. o. b. Detroit was advertised on every automobile-advertisement billboard. From it one could determine the delivered price. But, as I have said, today it is necessary to use a slide rule, and almost use an ouija board, in order to determine what the delivered price should be.

Mr. President, the automobile dealers themselves are beginning to recognize how their industry is being hurt by this flimflam.

Out of all the confusion there came—as usual, not from on high, not from the booming voices of big business or big labor, but from a hardheaded, and I may add, a hard-hit small-business man who recognizes the economic facts of life when he sees them—some worthwhile information.

Mr. George G. Downes, president of the New Jersey Automobile Dealers Association, sent to me the results of a poll of the automobile dealers of New Jersey. This question was presented to the dealers:

If all manufacturers consistently advertised an "advertised delivered price" listing what is included in the price, as well as Federal tax, freight, and an item to cover handling and delivery * * *

Would you then favor such procedure?

Mr. President, of the 257 replies received within 1 week, 245—or 94 percent—of the dealers voted for the proposition.

The growing concern of the dealers is reflected by the fact that the National Automobile Dealers' Association at its recent convention adopted the unanimous recommendation of its board of directors, as follows: "That NADA continue to urge all manufacturers to use and advertise realistic uniform delivered prices on a national basis."

NADA's executive vice president, Adm. Frederick J. Bell, had this to say at a recent Senate committee hearing:

In the matter of pricing, we have recommended to the manufacturers that they return to a practice—that existed for many years in the industry—of having a nationally advertised uniform delivered price for their products.

Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate the impromptu testimony of Birkett L. Williams. Mr. Williams, a Ford dealer from Cleveland, Ohio, frankly exposed the racket of packing new-car prices in order that the buyer will be fooled into thinking he is getting a higher trade-in allowance for his used car. This is what Mr. Williams testified on February 19 of this year, at a hearing of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

I would like to say that nothing we want is in any way intended to lessen or do away with competition. I think we are all smart enough to know that the life of good business is keen competition and the ability to survive under those conditions.

But we would like to be able to get, as Fred Bell pointed out this morning, some decent ground rules under which we could play which we don't feel we can get at the present time.

Now nobody knows what the price of an automobile is today, and too many customers, too many consumers, are flimflammed, cheated, skinned because they go in and they trade on the mistaken theory that the only thing that makes any difference to them is how much they get for their old car.

Well, now, if one man prices his new car at \$2,000, and the other man is pricing the same car at \$2,200, obviously the second man can give him \$200 more for the old car and still be even. Maybe he only gives him \$100 more, and by raising the price of his new car unduly, he has profited himself—the dealer, I mean—\$100. That is the sort of thing we would like to eliminate. We would like to get the deception, the flimflam stuff, the slight of hand, out of this business, and be able to get it on a basis where people know what the price of the car is, and know what they are paying for the car, and to eliminate all this razzle-dazzle stuff that is making all the trouble.

Mr. H. H. Stuart, publisher of Motor News Analysis, a widely read and informative automobile newsletter, further has amplified on the effect of this price confusion. I ask unanimous consent that his comments be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PUBLIC FORCED TO SHOP FOR AUTO PRICES

Just what is cross-selling? Might it not as well be called cross-buying? Who causes it? Dealer? Prospect?

Dealers blame fellow dealers. But could latter draw prospects from other areas unless those people were willing to desert their hometown dealer in hope of finding better value of treatment elsewhere.

What possible gimmick in contracts or in law can stop this perfectly human urge? With no public pricing structure anywhere in this industry car prospects are compelled to shop to find out how much autos cost.

Factory advertising gives no clue whatever to car prices; myriad options only serve to confuse, mystify, obscure. Public is told it can't trust dealer pricing when NADA's Sutter publicly deplores shady practices at retail level. What can innocent, befuddled prospect do except plod from dealer to dealer hoping somewhere along his route to meet some guy he feels he can trust, some quoted prices he thinks reasonable?

Why this price mystery? Is it not primarily due to factory abandonment of advertised delivered price? Did not that open door to packs, gimmicks, bait ads, other screwy devices in local dealer promotion?

And would not many of these devious practices fade in light of factory advertised prices formulated, not to take advantage of competition but to give public honest information?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the automobile dealers are in favor of such a price label, and if, as I sincerely believe, the public is in favor of such a price label, who could be against it? Is each factory afraid to take this step, for fear of losing competitive advantage? Or have the manufacturers of automobiles sought to prevent price competition by abandoning the once standard advertising of the delivered price? Former Assistant Attorney General Stanley Barnes, an able Republican trustbuster, has charged that the automobile manufacturers compete in every way except as to price.

At the present time, the suggested retail prices of automobiles and accessories are furnished to every automobile dealer by the factory. But the dealer cannot afford to make them public, or else he will lose in the competitive swim, for then he could not pretend to overallow for the customer's used automobile.

Perhaps the greatest effect of automobile price tags would be to halt the wild, deceitful, gimmick advertising. No dealer can offer \$1,000 for anything that runs unless he adds that \$1,000 to the new car price. He could not pack prices in that way if there were a label showing the factory suggested retail price. This would transfer the competitive advantage from the most deceitful dealer in town to the dealer of the highest character and efficiency.

I read a headline from an ad appearing in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, March 13, 1958:

Three hundred dollars cash and free weekend in New York will be given to the lucky buyer.

That is an example of some of the foolish and extravagant advertising claims made in order to sell cars at a price that never reveals what the honest list price is.

I have followed the advertising of automobile dealers from coast to coast for months, and I have been unable to find, except in rare instances, advertising by even the most responsible and respect-

able dealers that carries a standard advertised list or delivered price.

There are other things beside price that are important to the car buyer. He wants to know the condition of the car and how it got from the assembly plant to the dealer. Was it towed with the speedometer disconnected? Has it been shuttled from dealer to dealer? Is it really a bootlegged or a used or mis-used car?

If the purchaser wants to buy a bootlegged car, it is his privilege, but at least he should be able to find out if it has been bootlegged and where it started from.

The car buyer has a right to know the quality, condition, and price of the biggest investment he ever makes in his lifetime except for his home.

If pillows must be labeled, if bacon must be labeled, if even beans must be labeled for the protection of the consumer, surely cars should be.

Mr. President, if we have faith in the American marketing system, we believe that a citizen who has the facts can take care of himself. We should allow the car buyer to have the facts, and not allow the manufacturers to force him to go through the time consuming and sometimes frightening ordeal of today's automobile guessing game.

If the car buyer has the facts, we shall have less cause to worry about whether prices are too high or too low. The processes of competition would help to determine that. But there can be no competition in prices unless the purchaser can find out what the prices are.

Mr. President, I submit a bill which would require a label to be placed on the windshield of every new car. On this label would be detailed the advertised price of the car, accessories, freight, and also the method of transportation, and the dealer to whom it was first sold.

I feel that unless the automobile industry—a slump in which is now threatening the prosperity of the Nation—does not return to the fundamentals of clean, honest, true merchandising, all the public-works programs that can be enacted in this Congress—and I am a coauthor of many of them—will be of little avail in reviving the No. 1 industry of America. Incidentally, more than 17 percent of the people of Michigan are unemployed.

I believe competition must come about in the pricing of automobiles. I believe by forcing a factory to commit itself on an advertised delivered list price, we will do something toward accomplishing that objective.

It will be found that Ford and Chevrolet will try to beat each other's advertised price on the same kind of model. The price is the first thing the buyer needs to know about an automobile. As I stated earlier, it is at that point that there comes into play the great American sport of bargaining. If the delivered retail price is hidden away in the vaults of the Detroit manufacturers, or concealed only in the files of the dealer, the customer does not have the information he needs.

But do not think, Mr. President, that the customer is a "dope." Do not under-

estimate the intelligence of the American automobile buyer. No matter how the dealer or manufacturer may try to confuse the price, the automobile buyer has a device for meeting the situation. Today he is meeting it by staying out of the automobile showrooms, by not looking at cars, because he is tired of chasing all over town in an attempt to find what the price is.

There should be a suggested or nationally advertised delivered price of the car.

In conclusion, it seems to me this bill would establish truth in advertising.

It would establish truth in merchandising.

I believe it is the best way to protect the automobile-buying public.

USE OF SURPLUS FOODS TO ASSIST NEEDY FAMILIES IN COMMUNITIES SUFFERING FROM SERIOUS UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have received appeals from the mayors of La Crosse and Ashland, Wis., and from a great many individual citizens and community leaders in my State, to help obtain a larger quantity and a better selection of foods for needy families in communities suffering from serious unemployment.

I have learned that the Secretary of Agriculture has funds available, totaling \$514 million, for the purchase, processing, and distribution to the States of surplus foods for schools, welfare institutions, and needy families.

In addition, Congress has authorized another \$500 million to be appropriated if it is needed for this purpose.

Of this total of \$1,014,000,000 authorized by Congress, the administration's present plans call for spending only \$143 million—or less than one-seventh of the total.

The Secretary of Agriculture has ruled that items other than cornmeal, wheat, flour, cheese, dried milk, and rice are not in sufficient surplus to justify distribution to needy families.

Mr. President, the present unemployment emergency creates an urgent need for supplementary food supplies for needy families.

The Secretary of Agriculture has rejected recent requests for distribution of high-protein foods which are required to provide balanced emergency diets for needy families.

It is a shocking contradiction to have the same Department of the Government, on the one hand, justify low prices to farmers on the ground that there are burdensome surpluses, while on the other hand it is denying food for needy families, and also for the school-lunch program and welfare institutions, on the ground that there is not a sufficient surplus to warrant the use of the funds provided by Congress for that purpose.

Prices of many agricultural commodities which would be very valuable from the standpoint of providing balanced diets to those in need are extremely low. The following are the present parity

percentages of some of the most depressed commodities:

Turkeys, 67 percent of parity; chickens, 69 percent; milk, 84 percent; butterfat, 79 percent; peanuts suitable for processing into peanut butter, 74 percent; eggs, 84 percent; and sheep, 81 percent.

I am introducing a bill to broaden the present statutory authority in respect to the distribution of food to the needy. My bill will direct that the funds available be put to use to provide increased quantities and a better selection from the standpoint of requirements for balanced diets, of the food products which our economy produces in such abundance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie on the table until the close of business tomorrow to allow other Senators who wish to do so to add their names as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received, appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 3501) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to expend funds appropriated for the diversion of surplus farm commodities to provide balanced diets in schools and institutions and for needy families, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the bill would make it possible to do what I am sure virtually every Senator desires to do, and that is put our great abundance of food into the stomachs of hungry people. There is no reason on earth why it should not be done. The money is available. It has been appropriated. The food is available in surplus. The people are hungry. They need it. Mayors of cities in Wisconsin have asked for it. Outstanding citizens have asked for it. It should be done as promptly as possible.

INCREASED FUNDS FOR MATERNAL HEALTH AND CHILD HEALTH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in November of 1957 the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers recommended, in one of their formal resolutions, that Congress raise the statutory ceiling on maternal and child health and crippled children funds to \$25 million for each fiscal year, from \$16.5 million and \$15 million, respectively.

The recommendations, Mr. President, were based on a detailed analysis of the job ahead and of the financial problems faced by the States which participate in this vital Federal-State grant-in-aid program. Basic among the problems of all States and affecting both the MCH and CC programs, are increases in costs, the increase in child population, and the need for trained personnel.

While the Bureau of Census reports that, between 1955 and 1965, the number of children under 18 years of age will increase by 21 percent and reach a total of 67 million, the cost of public health

personnel continues to rise. Between 1947 and 1953, the salaries of public health nurses increased on an average of 74 percent. In addition to the cost of those who are already trained, States report that they require more personnel and more opportunities to provide graduate training in various aspects of the MCH and CC programs. The recommended increase in the Federal grants would allow the States to develop these long-range goals.

It is most urgent, Mr. President, that more Federal funds be made available to these child-health programs. I have learned from a highly respected and qualified authority in this field, my good friend, Dr. Martha M. Eliot, chairman of the Department of Maternal and Child Health, Harvard University, that at the present time there are many children whose operative care must be delayed because of a lack of funds in State agencies. Likewise, many States are not able to do needed work for children with rheumatic heart disease, for children who are deaf and require hearing aids, and for children with cleft palate. According to Dr. Eliot one of the newest and most appealing programs which is limited by a lack of funds is the provision of artificial arms and legs for children who either have been born without an arm or leg or have been injured in accidents. Amazing advances have been made in the manufacture of small-sized arms and legs for infants as small as 18 months of age. Yet, because of a shortage of funds, many children are still awaiting the opportunity to lead the normal life which these advances permit.

Mr. President, a Nation which spends over \$40 billion a year for defense cannot afford, on either a humanitarian or a practical basis, to allow a resource as priceless as the health of its children to go without the best possible medical treatment. Therefore, I am proud to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would raise the statutory ceiling on maternal health and crippled children funds to \$25 million. I request that the bill appear in the Record along with my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3504) to increase the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the programs of maternal and child health services and services for crippled children provided for by title V of the Social Security Act, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 501 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the sum of \$15 million, and for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1951, the sum of \$16,500,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1958, the sum of \$25 million."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 502 (a) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "1958",

and (2) by striking out "\$8,250,000" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,500,000."

(c) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of such act is amended to read as follows: "Out of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 the Secretary shall allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made under subsection (a)) for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1958, the sum of '\$12,500,000.'"

SEC. 2. (a) Section 511 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the sum of \$12 million, and for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1951, the sum of \$15 million", and inserting in lieu thereof "for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1958, the sum of \$25 million."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 512 (a) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "1958", and (2) by striking out "\$7,500,000" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,500,000."

(c) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 512 of such act is amended to read as follows: "Out of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 511 the Secretary shall allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made under subsection (a)) for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1958, the sum of '\$12,500,000.'"

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1958.

AMENDMENT OF MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING STAMP ACT OF 1934—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON (by request) submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2617) to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF METHOD OF BASIC PAY FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in accordance with the statement of the Honorable Charles S. Rhyne, president of the American Bar Association, before the Stennis subcommittee handling military pay legislation (S. 3081), that such general military pay legislation be amended to incorporate the provisions of two bills which I have previously introduced, S. 1165 and S. 1093, I have prepared and do now offer the substance of these bills as amendments to that effect and ask that the amendments be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and be printed. These amendments will carry out the objectives of the American Bar Association as set forth in Mr. Rhyne's statement, which statement was placed in the body of the RECORD on Friday last. That statement is fully descriptive of the urgently critical problems existing in connection with the procurement and retention of lawyers in the Armed Forces whose professional services afford protection not only to the individual rights of our citizens, but also to the economic interests of the American people. In addition, I made a statement before the Stennis subcommittee

and my study has revealed the critical nature of this matter. Unless some action is taken we will have arrived at a situation which will be impossible to correct. Within 3 years we will see practically all of the experienced lawyers leaving active duty, and we will not have qualified legal personnel in the military services to protect the interests of the United States, either at home or abroad, nor will they be available to protect the interests of the boys we are drafting. I therefore urge that immediate consideration be given to this problem.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and be printed.

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENTS

Mr. AIKEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1950, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3420, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TECHNICAL CHANGES IN FEDERAL EXCISE-TAX LAWS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUSH submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7125) to make technical changes in the Federal excise-tax laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

DAIRY PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT OF 1958—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3456) to provide a substantially self-financing program to protect the returns of producers of milk and butterfat used in manufactured dairy products to the producers thereof, to provide a formula for computing parity farm income and parity income equivalent prices, to establish a Federal Dairy Advisory Committee, to promote and protect and encourage family-scale farming in the dairy industry, to enable milk producers to keep supplies in reasonable balance with the need and demand therefor, to prevent discrimination between the various manufactured dairy products in Government food-purchasing programs, and for other purposes, introduced by me, for myself, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. HUMPHREY, on March 12, 1958.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

Address delivered by him to the Indiana State Republican dinner on October 14, 1957.

Address delivered by him to the Knights of Columbus in East Chicago, Ind., on November 6, 1957.

Statement by him on S. 2646, relating to the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Snowball," which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Saturday, March 15, 1958, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SNOWBALL

It is seldom helpful to keep telling a patient who is ill that he may die. Too many quick generalizations about particular economic statistics could have a similar effect on the country in the recession.

Let there be no mistake: the recession is serious, and it justifies the concern about it. But there seems to be little smugness on this subject either on Capitol Hill or in the White House. The caution in the administration, and among some legislators, is primarily the care that properly is exercised in prescribing drastic drugs before the diagnosis is exact. There is certainly a danger in doing too little; but there also is a danger, if all the nostrums are applied at once, of losing a mammoth reinflation that would be equally damaging to the country.

The resources of Government are dedicated, both by law and by determination, to the prevention of economic catastrophe. Apart from the interest rate reductions by the Federal Reserve Board, the administration already has taken a number of steps. The Defense Department, for example, has announced plans to let \$10 billion in contracts by June 30—\$4 billion more than during the last half of 1957. There are similar plans to speed up public works and reclamation spending.

Congress has been no less busy. The Senate has passed an emergency housing bill as well as a resolution to accelerate public works and military programs. Measures to extend unemployment benefits are sure to pass. A number of tax cut proposals, encompassing personal income, corporation, and excise taxes, either individually or in combination, are in readiness and could be applied quickly if such sweeping action were found desirable.

It is against this background that the new estimates on personal spending and plant and equipment expenditures for 1958 ought to be considered. The 13-percent drop in plant expansion is troubling, but the fact that business outlays are down is scarcely new. The \$32.1 billion which industry is expected to spend is still a great deal of money.

No individual statistic is a reliable guide in this complex matter of assessing the state of the economy. Unemployment, particularly in certain distressed areas, justifies much of the worry expressed by the AFL-CIO. Yet department store sales last week were up 7 percent over a year ago. Railroad carloadings were down, but applications for FHA mortgages in February showed an astounding rise.

The point is that this frenetic pulsetaking every few moments can do as much harm as

good. It is unlikely that the country will or can talk itself out of the recession; some price adjustments and corollary wage restraint, in addition to governmental action already instituted, probably will be necessary. But it is altogether possible for the country to talk itself into something worse, in the manner of a hypochondriac.

Most of us tend to make judgments based on the prevailing confidence or state of mind. And if we keep telling each other, almost masochistically, how dreadful we feel, it will be easy to develop a psychology of recession that will further affect purchasing in snowball fashion. Neither the public nor Government alone can restore confidence, but both together can. Let there be no attempt to hide the facts, grim or otherwise. But let all of us, particularly those who interpret the figures, try to keep them in perspective.

IMPORTANCE OF HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENT TO COORDINATE WITH THE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today we start consideration of legislation to strengthen the Federal-State highway program.

Our purpose is twofold: (a) To expedite this vital program for its own sake so as to provide for improved automotive and truck transportation for the American people and thereby increase safety, lower costs, and so forth; and

(b) To help enable highway construction to pick up the slack in our economy.

As the Midwest views the highway program, one of its most interesting features is the relationship between that program and the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

It is our hope and belief that as the 27-foot, 2,300-mile deep-water seaway comes into being, it will be served by an improved road network which will get the goods to and from the docks rapidly.

One of the big problems of American highway transportation, however, is that the huge tractor-trailers which currently move night and day across this Nation's highways, at 50 miles an hour or more, are slowed to a snail's pace when they get into American cities.

And as they approach dockside areas, which are especially crowded, the tractor-trailers become almost immobilized. The result is unnecessary delay and higher costs of transportation.

It is the hope of the Midwest, therefore, that the Federal highway program will, indeed, be accelerated and that it will help provide for improved access to the Nation's port areas.

Other actions are, likewise, essential if the full promise of the St. Lawrence Seaway is to be realized.

First, As indicated on the Senate floor on March 12, there must be a speedup in appropriations for the Great Lakes connecting channels. The current budget for 1959 contains only around \$18 million for deepening the channels. At this rate it will be long after 1962 before the channels to the upper Lake States are both 27-foot downbound and upbound.

The deadline must be advanced, instead of pushed back. The channels must be completed as soon as possible.

Second. There must be improvement of harbors along the lakes so that they can make fullest use of the seaway.

Right now there are no less than 13 harbors in my own State that can accommodate moderate-sized seagoing vessels. But only three of these harbors, Ashland, Milwaukee, and Superior, now have channel depths about the same as the seaway. Both these and other harbors must be improved if they are to get full advantage of deep-draft shipping.

These and related facts were pointed out in an excellent statement which was delivered by Mr. Robert Mathes on the occasion of the 45th Wisconsin Highway Conference in January of this year. Mr. Mathes is the port-development specialist serving in the Wisconsin Division of Industrial Development. This division, in turn, is attached to the office of Gov. Vernon Thomson.

I believe that this statement will be of deep interest to all friends of the St. Lawrence Seaway as an illustration of what the alert State of Wisconsin is thinking and planning in terms of maximum State and National prosperity from the seaway.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN PORT DEVELOPMENT AS IT RELATES TO HIGHWAY PLANNING

(By Robert F. Mathes, port development specialist, State of Wisconsin Division of Industrial Development)

Governor Thomson, Mayor Zeldler, Vice Chairman Doyme, President Howard, gentlemen. I am very happy to be here today and to have the opportunity to explain to you our study for the development of Wisconsin port cities.

It is significant that my talk is being given in Milwaukee because port development is not a new subject here. Under the guidance of Mr. H. C. Brockel, your very able municipal port director, and the City of Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners, the planning and growth of one of the finest ports on the Great Lakes has taken place. Your city leaders are to be commended for their foresight in preparing the port of Milwaukee for a leading role in the development of world commerce via the St. Lawrence Seaway.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The St. Lawrence Seaway navigation and power projects are among the major construction projects undertaken by man. The work being done to harness this great waterway is especially commendable because it is the joint effort of two nations—the United States and Canada. When the seaway is completed in the spring of 1959, for the first time in history, large oceangoing ships will be able to sail more than 2,000 miles from the Atlantic Ocean to our Wisconsin port cities on Lakes Michigan and Superior.

The St. Lawrence Seaway project, long a dream of many of us both in the United States and Canada, became a reality in May 1954, when President Eisenhower signed into law the enabling legislation introduced by our Senator ALEXANDER WILEY and Congressman George Dondero, of Michigan. Previously, in December 1951, the Government of Canada had approved similar legislation.

The term "seaway" applies to the manmade improvements along 180 miles of the St. Lawrence River between Lake Ontario and Montreal. The river here is studded with islands, sharp bends, and rapids which until now, have made navigation by large ships impossible. The work now underway will eliminate these obstacles by providing a navigable

channel 27 feet deep and from 200 to 450 feet wide through this area. A series of 7 locks are being constructed to permit vessels to bypass the rapids, which cause the level of the river to fall from 246 feet above sea level on Lake Ontario to only 20 feet above sea level at Montreal.

Concurrent with the navigation improvements, the State of New York and the Province of Ontario are erecting a system of power dams that will utilize the flow of this mighty river to produce 2 million kilowatts of electricity. The St. Lawrence River, fed by the largest natural reservoir in the world—the five Great Lakes—has a remarkably even flow of water, making it an ideal source for the generation of electricity. The 3,200-foot-long St. Lawrence power dam, being erected near Massena, N. Y., will be the second longest hydroelectric power dam in the world, exceeded in length only by Grand Coulee Dam in the State of Washington. A second dam, the Long Sault Dam is being constructed nearby to control the slight fluctuations in the river level in order to provide a constant flow of water at the power dam. This part of the project will be completed and placed into operation July 1 of this year.

The entire St. Lawrence Seaway project will cost about \$1 billion. The navigation phase of the work will cost about \$450 million, paid about one-third by the United States and two-thirds by Canada. This work will be paid for from tolls charged to the vessels passing through the waterway. The power phase of the project will cost about \$600 million, paid equally by New York State and Ontario. This work will be paid for from the sale of electric power generated at the dam.

IMPORTANCE TO WISCONSIN

What does the St. Lawrence Seaway mean to Wisconsin? A look at the map will show you that Wisconsin's shores are at the head of the Great Lakes. In other words, we are situated as far inland as ships can come.

This location makes Wisconsin the natural site for the establishment of industrial plants that can import their principal raw materials by water and that plan to market their products in the areas of this country and Canada that lie between the western Great Lakes and the Rocky Mountains. Water transportation is inexpensive, and is employed to its best advantage for the carriage of low value bulk cargoes such as iron ore, coal, gypsum rock, sulfur, phosphate rock, and a multitude of other commodities found here and abroad that are consumed in our manufacturing processes. The opening of the seaway will permit large oceangoing ships to carry full shiploads, of as much as 25,000 tons, in the case of high density iron ore, directly to waterfront plant sites in Great Lakes port cities.

Fortunately, Wisconsin is ready to capitalize on this new transportation medium because we can boast 13 harbors that can already accommodate moderate size seagoing vessels. Only 3 of these harbors—Ashland, Milwaukee, and Superior—now have channel depths about the same as the seaway. Proposals to improve the others, however, are presently under study as part of the most comprehensive single transportation study project ever undertaken by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal agency responsible for providing navigable ship channels in United States harbors. What is important to us now is the fact that many necessary harbor improvements, such as breakwaters, bulkheads, movable bridges, Coast Guard stations, and navigation light-houses and buoys, already have been built. Of even more significance from the standpoint of industrial development, our port cities have sound industrial zoning ordinances and waterfront sites available for the erection of industrial plants. Having these physical essentials, our cities also can boast

that extra ingredient that is so very important in any program of this sort, namely, an enthusiasm for port development on the part of local citizens.

Two other advantages will be open to us when the seaway is completed next year. One will be the growth of foreign general cargo or merchandise trade, and the other will be the delivery of many products by water that now arrive via overland routes.

The term "foreign general cargo trade" describes the exporting and importing of the myriad of commodities that are traded amongst the countries of the world. This commerce, which includes almost every item from sewing needles to railway locomotives, and medicinal pills to live elephants, moves between the world's major ports on ships we generally term "freighters." Several of our Great Lakes ports, already very active in this trade, are improving their terminal facilities in order to handle what we anticipate will be a sizable increase in general cargo shipping next year.

In order to handle general cargo, a port operation must include a multitude of ancillary services, such as stevedoring, banking, customs, insurance, and export packing. And in order to make port calls profitable to ship operators, large minimum quantities of cargoes must be offered for each scheduled departure. Because of these requirements, it will be unwise for all but a few of our port cities to envision themselves as becoming leading general cargo ports.

The development of terminals for the receipt of specialized shipments will warrant the attention of several of Wisconsin's port cities, especially those located near the large Milwaukee-Chicago population center. Since the end of the war, several enterprising ship operators have successfully carried in bulk certain commodities traditionally delivered already packaged. Three of these commodities, transported in a rather spectacular fashion, are industrial chemicals, wine, and orange juice. These cargoes, all liquid, are carried between ports on the Atlantic, gulf and Pacific coasts of the United States in ships resembling the familiar petroleum tanker. At the destination, the liquids are pumped ashore into storage tanks at terminal facilities where they are bottled or packaged for local distribution and sale. This new method of shipment reduces both transportation costs and damage claims.

PORT DEVELOPMENT IN WISCONSIN

Last year the State legislature established the position of port development specialist, to which I have been appointed, within the Wisconsin Division of Industrial Development. This division, as you know, is attached to the Governor's office. The purpose of my work is to assist Wisconsin port cities in the formulation of their port development programs and to make recommendations to the Governor and the legislature on port development matters that affect the State as a whole.

My principal task, since I began my work here in Wisconsin about 3 months ago, has been to visit each of the harbors in our State. I have made trips to the port cities on Lake Michigan and Superior, along the Mississippi River and on the shores of Green Bay. Much to my pleasant surprise, I learned that there are about 25 cities and towns in Wisconsin with developed port facilities. These vary from improvements to river mouths for the shelter of recreation and fishing craft, to the development of the finest ports on the Great Lakes. I completed this indoctrination phase of my work only last week.

The next phases of my activity shall be to analyze the foreign trade patterns of Wisconsin exporters and importers, and to determine what types of industries would benefit by locating in one of our lakefront cities. I shall also investigate the ways that the growth of pleasure boating may affect our harbor improvement program.

In order to obtain the necessary data on Wisconsin's foreign trade, the University of Wisconsin School of Commerce is undertaking a detailed survey of this subject. Last autumn, by means of a postcard survey, the research group assigned to this study learned that one-half of our firms do some exporting and importing. The School of Commerce is now distributing questionnaires to these companies, asking for additional information regarding the quantity of goods that are exported and imported now and what volume is anticipated a few years hence, their foreign market areas or sources of materials, and the plans of these companies to use our Great Lakes ports upon the completion of the seaway.

I shall be working closely with the other members of the division of industrial development staff in order to learn which industries we should approach for discussions of relocation plans. You may have read that our office has retained an advertising agency to carry on our nationwide advertising program. One element of this program will be to explain to these industries the advantages our lakefront harbors have to offer.

As a more individual service to Wisconsin port cities, we shall assist in evaluating the suitability of waterfront sites for the construction of marine or industrial terminal facilities. The first aim of our studies shall be to determine the economic need for the proposed terminals. Beyond that, if the proposed projects appear to be feasible, we shall analyze the physical suitability of the sites by studying such items as the adequacy of the navigable channel, the accessibility to railroad and truck transportation, the suitability of subsurface conditions, and the size, layout, and design of the proposed terminal construction. Where the magnitude of the projects indicate that our staff cannot handle the work, we can assist in finding competent consultants.

HIGHWAY INTEREST IN PORT DEVELOPMENT

The interest that the members of the Wisconsin highway conference have in the development of our ports stems directly from the importance of motor truck transportation to today's port operations. Wisconsin's early and sincere concern with the improvement of highway transportation is evident from our fine highway system and our early regulation of motor carriers.

I understand that Wisconsin can boast one of the best secondary road systems in the United States. After driving over many of these roads in my recent travels to all parts of the State, and comparing them to similar roads in many other States I have visited, I can attest to the truth of this statement.

Good local roads are vitally necessary to permit our farmers to deliver their produce to market; they are going to be a great asset in enabling our manufacturers—especially those located in the more remote parts of the State—to carry their export products to our port cities and to bring back their import goods in return.

You are all well aware of the phenomenal growth of the motor carrier business within the past two decades. I have been informed that here in Wisconsin, trucks haul almost all our milk and paper products, and carry from one-half to more than 90 percent of our poultry, eggs, butter and—beer. Wisconsin has been a leader in regulating the operation of motor trucks in the carriage of commerce, and led the Federal Government by 2 years in the passage of the present Motor Carrier Act.

I have already mentioned that trucks play an important role in carrying world commerce to and from our harbors. In the great Port of New York, for instance, about one-half the general cargo that is unloaded from ships is delivered to consumer by truck, while about 20 percent of the exports are

carried from manufacturer to steamship pier by truck.

How can you help improve this flow of goods between our factories and our harbors? By sound planning of new arterial highways and local access streets in and around our port cities, and by the establishment of traffic ordinances designed to speed the flow of truck traffic to and from the waterfront. Close cooperation with municipal and county boards of harbor commissioners is essential to effectively achieve this program.

One of the major problems which confronts our large coastal seaports is vehicular-traffic congestion. Their streets were built decades ago to accommodate horse-drawn drey carts, not the large over-the-road tractor trailers in use today. These big trucks speed across modern turnpikes to get to these cities, only to lose this precious time advantage when they arrive because they have to creep along busy narrow streets to get to the waterfront, and then they frequently must wait in line for hours before they can drive into a narrow pier shed, where, after they are unloaded, they must back out because there is not enough room at the end of the pier to permit them to turn around. This is not to say that our seacoast ports are not striving very hard to correct this situation. They are doing a marvelous job in this respect. What we want to do is to benefit from their mistakes in our own street and highway planning.

There are a number of important points regarding streets that we must consider in our port-planning activities. As I mention them you will undoubtedly note that they are adapted from criteria you have frequently utilized. They are as follows:

(a) An arterial highway system designed to bypass congested business districts and to route trucks directly to the waterfront.

(b) A street system within the harbor-terminal area adequate to accommodate large over-the-road trucks.

(c) An efficient traffic-flow pattern in the terminal area and on the piers.

(d) Sufficient parking facilities behind and inside the pier sheds to accommodate trucks that arrive to load or unload cargo.

(e) Ample parking space in the terminal area for longshoremen and pier personnel.

(f) One point not concerned with port planning alone—adequate separation of highways and railroad tracks to permit the erection of industrial buildings in between.

In conclusion, let me say that you can be of the greatest assistance to our port-planning program by carefully considering these criteria and by working closely with local harbor boards whenever you plan streets and highways in Wisconsin port cities. By doing this you will be contributing in the most helpful way possible to our overall effort to develop the finest harbors on the Great Lakes.

SEARCH FOR PEACE BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, sometimes it is the little thing that shapes the course of world events.

Today America's position is portrayed by the Communist world network of propaganda as that of a warmonger. Sometimes I fear we help give credence to this canard by emphasizing in our publicity our progress in science for death, instead of science for life.

Saturday night the famous Washington Gridiron Club departed from its usual practice of lampooning the great and the near great with only satirical songs, written to parody the well-known song hits of today and of yesterday. I am told that this is one of the few times in its 73 years that this has been done.

This departure came in a serious closing song that brought the banquet to a cheering climax. This song was entitled "Around the World We Search for Peace."

It was written to the music of *Around the World in 80 Days*, which movie by Producer Mike Todd, has just been awarded the title of the "Best Moving Picture of the Year" by Film Daily's poll of critics, reviewers, and commentators.

I hope other Senators will join me in requesting the Voice of America to ask Producer Todd to release the copyright privileges on the music—with the words of the gridiron song—to be used as the theme song of the Voice of America.

Sometimes a good song is worth a thousand speeches. This is such a song, and the music going around the world for 80 days may help to show the world the peace-loving face of Uncle Sam instead of the grim face of military power.

It might be possible to translate this beautiful song and the wonderful theme of the words into other languages so that we could touch the heart of the world with the true desire of every American to find the road to a just and a lasting peace.

The words of the closing Gridiron song were written by Frederic W. Collins, Washington correspondent of the Providence Journal, and were sung by Gene Archer, with Fletcher Knebel as music chairman. The words are:

Around the world we search for peace.
Our goal is clear, we'll persevere. Our hope shall never cease.

We know somewhere, sometime, somehow
Mankind will know the blessed glow, he deeply prays for now.

Where hate and strife and fear now reign,
Let men and nations join their hearts and hands as one again

And pledge their vow that all around the world,
We'll always find our world at peace.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY—1958

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the Irish are a proud people—proud of their heritage and of their traditions.

But I don't think anyone ever called the Irish selfish about these things. An example of this unselfishness is the willingness of the Irish to share their beloved saint—St. Patrick—with one and all on every March 17.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from today's New York Times, entitled "Everybody's Saint," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYBODY'S SAINT

One doesn't have to be Irish in order to have an affection for St. Patrick—St. Patrick wasn't Irish, either, not by birth. This doesn't prevent St. Patrick's Day from being the festival of a particular faith and an especial nation, but it does make it possible for those among us who never walked down O'Connell Street or kissed the Blarney Stone or rode in a jaunting car around the Lakes of Killarney to be glad when this saint's day rolls around.

St. Patrick's Day doesn't come in what the calendar says is spring, and that is fair

warning. However, there is a kind of spring thought in it. Its green is for Ireland, which is indeed a fair green land, but it is also because it won't be long now before the turn of the year will be at hand, and we can all relax and live happy ever after.

But St. Patrick's Day is mainly a day when everybody is, or ought to be, good-natured and in a kindly mood toward everybody else. It is true that the Irish have done enough fighting in their day—too much, to be sure, like the rest of the world. They are not a docile people, putting up gently with injustice. When there was no fighting to do at home they often went out and looked for it: they defended liberty in our own Revolution; they fought for the Union (and for the Confederacy, too, for that matter) in our own Civil War, and they were almost as numerous on freedom's side of the second World War as they would have been if their government had joined in it with the other democracies.

St. Patrick was willing enough to fight when necessary: against sin, against snakes, against anything that he judged was hostile to God's will. But it isn't fighting we think about today—and this day, in this year, in this generation, in this often sad, and tragic time, is a good day to think of a saint who was full to the brim of his heart with goodwill and a cheerful love for all mankind.

And he loved life, too—the parade would surprise him, for he was not a proud man, but he'd keep time to the drums, the pipes, and the brasses like the rest of us, and he wouldn't find any irreverence, where none is meant, in those who love his humanity as well as his saintliness.

CONTROL OF SIGNBOARDS ON THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, 1 week from now the Senate is scheduled to begin debate of a major new highway bill. Along with many other very constructive features, this bill will include a significant new section to protect the investment which America's traveling public is making in the highways through their taxes on gasoline and other automotive necessities. The bill will include a section to encourage and assist State regulation of billboards along the new Interstate Highway System.

I want to address a brief plea today particularly to my Democratic colleagues on this side of the Senate aisle, regarding this provision of the new highway bill.

Mr. President, the battle to recognize roadside beauty and scenery as a legitimate aspect of the Federal interest in the national highway network has been waged from the beginning in total disregard of party lines. I initiated this effort when authorization of the new Interstate System first came before the subcommittee on roads, on which I serve. I have from the beginning had the support of the able chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. Other members from both sides of the subcommittee table joined in support. When the billboard-control provision first came to a vote in the full committee last year, and lost by one vote, party lines were not involved.

This year, the able junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who had reconsidered his previous opposition to the measure, and I joined together in submitting a single, unified billboard-control amendment to the highway bill. It

was further amended in committee to reflect the views of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. When the billboard-control amendment was adopted by the Public Works Committee this year, the vote again ignored party lines.

Mr. President, I recount this background to show that this issue has not been a partisan one. I am sure it will not be a party issue when it reaches the floor of the Senate. Instead—as I am sure every Senator knows from his mail and from editorial comment in the press of his State—it is a question of extremely widespread public interest, cutting across all political and economic lines, except of course for the narrow self-interest of the billboard industry itself.

It is, Mr. President, essentially a conservation issue in the broad sense of that term. And that is why I want to address my Democratic colleagues today—to suggest, not a spirit of partisan controversy, but perhaps of friendly competition with our colleagues on the other side in supporting the public interest in these spectacular new highways we are building across our land.

I want to remind my colleagues, Mr. President, that during modern times our party has been the party of conservation. I trust that Democratic Senators will recall, when they consider this issue, that ours is the party of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who set aside the Olympic National Park in Washington State and the Kings Canyon National Park of California; who established the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Great Plains Shelterbelt project, as well as the great river projects such as TVA, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee, the Central Valley and the Columbia Basin irrigation projects and many other good works to safeguard the natural resources and environment within which our Nation lives. More improvement of trails, shelters, and campgrounds took place in our national forests while Franklin D. Roosevelt was President than in any other era.

In addition, FDR was the man who founded our modern United States Fish and Wildlife Service and put it under the direction of a great career biologist like Dr. Ira Noel Gabrielson. He brought to the head of the United States Forest Service distinguished career forester Lyle F. Watts. Under the only President ever to be elected more than twice, the conservation agencies and conservation policies enjoyed their greatest support and highest prestige.

Can anyone doubt, Mr. President, where Franklin D. Roosevelt would have stood in the battle between the public and the billboard industry, with respect to preserving uncluttered and unobstructed the roadways of a vast, new, limited-access superhighway system across America? Can there be any question of where this great Democratic President would have stood, any more than that other conservationist, his illustrious Republican namesake who preceded him in the White House?

I trust members of our party will not turn their backs on this heritage, when

the issue is squarely joined in the Senate to decide whether or not outdoor advertising companies are to be handed, as a gift from Congress, the bonanza of plastering their signs along the \$40 billion worth of splendid new cross-country highways to be built from the taxes of traveling Americans. Billboard control has been included in this highway bill with the endorsement of the present administration. I believe President Eisenhower himself has expressed the wish that control could be accomplished. Can we do less than the extremely moderate steps now proposed to encourage and assist the States to act?

I hope that eminent leaders of the Democratic Party, such as ex-President Harry Truman, Gov. Adlai Stevenson, and others may find occasion to add their voices to the chorus demanding that the public interest in roadside billboard control be recognized by Congress in our highway legislation. One such leader has already done so, Mr. President, both by action in his own State and by public statements. The distinguished Governor of our most populous State, Gov. W. Averell Harriman, endorsed billboard control in testimony before our Senate Roads Subcommittee. In an article in the Reporter magazine, Governor Harriman explained what has been done in New York State, particularly on the beautiful New York State Thruway, and what ought to be done everywhere. In concluding my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD this article by Governor Harriman, from the Reporter of March 6, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GREAT GREEN PATH ACROSS AMERICA
(By Averell Harriman)

ALBANY.—It seems to me that the case for banning billboards on our new National System of Defense and Interstate Highways is both simple and irrefutable. We have mapped out and begun building what will be the largest superhighway system in the world. If we keep it free of billboards it can also be one of the most beautiful.

In the field of transportation, the American genius for the practical has created many objects of unique utility, ranging from the Yankee clippers to the Brooklyn Bridge, which have also been uniquely beautiful. The divided limited-access expressway, following the contours of the land rather than slicing through it, is in many ways our most impressive achievement yet. The gliding, effortless grace of these vast stretches of concrete sweeping along the American countryside has given a new dimension to travel, and thereby to life in the United States.

Three-quarters of the mileage of the Interstate System will be built over new rights-of-way, where no road has ever before existed. Since they can be entered only at 15- to 20-mile intervals, there will be none of the ribbon development that has grown up along our older roads. If the billboards are also kept away from our new superhighways the countryside will remain untouched; in constructing a military transportation system, we shall have built at the same time 41,000 miles of national park.

Legislation aimed at banning billboards from the Interstate System was defeated in Congressional committee last year. The same bill is up for action again this session, but if it fails again it may be too late. The

States, which are paying 10 percent of the cost and carrying out the actual construction, have already completed some sections. The billboards are already going up. Once they are up, there is little likelihood of their ever coming down.

Toward the end of last year's battle in Congress, Arthur Krock observed that the public didn't seem to care what happened. I think it might be more accurate to say that the public didn't know what was at stake. Perhaps it still does not. It may be we have shouted "colossal" at one another so often we have trouble recognizing something really big when it does come along. In much the way that space satellites were once looked upon by some as just another scientific gimmick, the Interstate System seems to be generally regarded as just another highway program.

It is a great deal more than that. The Highway Act of 1956 authorized the largest public-works program in history. We are not simply improving our road-transportation facilities, the way Indian trails were made into wagon routes which in turn became highways. We are creating an entirely new system to bind centers of population together in a vast network of four-lane, limited-access, and for the most part toll-free superhighways. In the age of the metropolis and the automobile, it will become the primary transportation system of the Nation. It will take at least 13 years to complete and will cost \$60 billion—three times the total capitalization of American railroads.

BLOCKING OUT THE CATSKILLS

Because what we are building is an entirely new system, it has become both more necessary and at the same time more possible for us to maintain our contacts with the strength and beauty of the American countryside. It is wrong to let the billboards spoil it all.

To understand the alternatives, one need only compare the New York State Thruway with Route 17, which connects with the thruway near my farm at Harriman 40 miles north of New York City. The thruway, running up the Hudson to Albany and from there west along the Mohawk to Buffalo and beyond, is one of the first major segments of the Interstate System to have been completed. In my opinion it is one of the most beautiful highways in the world, giving the traveler magnificent views of the Hudson and Mohawk Valleys. Route 17 runs through equally lovely country in the Catskill Mountains and along the southern tier of New York counties. It is not yet part of the Interstate System, but it is being rebuilt to interstate specifications by many of the same engineers who built the thruway. The only difference is that a State law forbids billboards within 500 feet of the thruway whereas Route 17, which is not so protected, is being lined with billboards that either block out the Catskills or distract the eyes from them.

As if that weren't bad enough in itself, we recently discovered that crews of workmen had been sent by unknown persons onto State property along a newly completed stretch of Route 17 to cut down stands of trees that were obstructing the view of some new billboards.

Banning billboards along the new Interstate Highways could scarcely be called a heavy blow to the advertising industry. There are 3,400,000 miles of streets and roads in the Nation, most of which remain open to as many billboards as advertisers are willing to pay for. The Interstate System will add a mere 1.2 percent to the total mileage. Moreover, the small businesses such as motels and restaurants that use billboards to advertise their whereabouts can do so at the exits, which are the only points where travelers can turn off the highways anyway.

The curious—and recently discovered—argument that billboards contribute to traffic safety by keeping people awake is an admirable bit of best-defense-is-a-strong-offense strategy, but that is about all that can be said for it. To be sure, it has not been established that billboards actually cause accidents on the open highways, although a study made by the Minnesota Department of Highways in cooperation with the United States Bureau of Public Roads indicated that the greater the number of nonofficial signs at intersections, the higher were the accident rates. As for the open highways, there is not one jot of scientifically documented evidence to prove billboards actually prevent accidents at any hour of the day, much less at night when most of them can't be seen anyway.

INDUCEMENT TO THE STATES

The responsibility for protecting the beauty of our new highways is inescapably that of the individual States that are designing and building them and will subsequently maintain them. Such is the power of the billboard interests, however, that it seems clear there will have to be some Federal inducement to persuade the States to act. Last year I requested the New York State Legislature to extend the thruway prohibition against billboards to all of our interstate and limited-access highways. The bill passed the assembly by a thumping 124 to 19, only to meet a silent death in a senate committee. I have requested legislative action again this year.

Senator ALBERT GORE of Tennessee, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Roads, is vigorously supporting a proposal to increase by three-quarters of 1 percent the amount the Federal Government will pay toward construction in any State that prohibits billboards within 660 feet of the interstate highway. This would add nothing to the total cost of the highways but it would provide a substantial inducement to State legislators. And it is they, after all, who must make the final decision.

**THE SENATE'S MAJORITY LEADER,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON**

MR. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished majority leader on his leadership during the past week. Last week was indeed a positive and constructive week in the history of the Senate. Action was taken which will put to work hundreds of thousands of persons who are now unemployed.

Considering the few weeks the Senate has been in session, this accomplishment was very remarkable, indeed. In verve and drive it has been compared by competent journalists with the first hundred days under President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It certainly constitutes a great landmark in Senate leadership. The majority leader deserves a world of credit for this.

As a Senator from Wisconsin, I feel certain I express the sentiment of the people of Wisconsin, especially those who are now out of work, who will be put to work by the accomplishments of last week. I express deep thanks for a remarkably able leadership.

**CALE P. HAUN AND JULIA FAY
HAUN—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC.
NO. 83)**

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr.
CLARK in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the Pres-**

ident of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 674, entitled "An act for the relief of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun."

The bill would provide that, for the purpose of determining the individual liability for income taxes for the taxable year 1953 of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun, sole stockholders of River Grange Co., Inc., which was liquidated pursuant to a plan of complete liquidation adopted on December 24, 1953, the elections of Cale P. Haun and Julia Fay Haun to have the benefits of section 112 (b) (7) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be considered to have been filed within 30 days after the adoption of such plan. The bill states that the mailing of such election was delayed, without negligence or fault on the part of such stockholders, beyond the 30th day following the adoption of such plan.

Section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 provides a special rule in the case of certain complete liquidations of domestic corporations occurring within 1 calendar month for the treatment of gain on the shares of stock owned by qualified electing shareholders. The effect of this section is to permit deferral of tax upon unrealized appreciation in the value of the property distributed in liquidation. An election to be governed by section 112 (b) (7) must be filed by the shareholder or by the liquidating corporation with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on or before midnight of the 30th day after adoption of the plan of liquidation. The bill would waive this requirement for the named taxpayers.

The records of the Treasury Department show that River Grange Co., Inc., adopted a plan of complete liquidation on December 24, 1953. The Internal Revenue Service began an examination of the return of this corporation on September 9, 1954, and a question arose as to whether the stockholders had filed an election under section 112 (b) (7). It was found that no such election had been filed. A representative of the taxpayers has advised that an election was mailed on or about September 10, 1954, which date was more than 7 months after the expiration of the statutory period for filing the election.

Except in the case of special circumstances, the enactment of special legislative relief for a taxpayer who has not made an election within the time prescribed by law constitutes an inequitable discrimination against other taxpayers similarly situated. The primary extenuating circumstance on which the taxpayers appear to rely in this instance is that a professional adviser, upon whom the taxpayers were accustomed to depend in legal matters, was incapacitated by illness 6 months prior to the adoption of the plan of liquidation so that the taxpayers were compelled to rely on other professional advisers. The circumstances of this case do not seem to justify special legislative relief.

The granting of special relief in this case would constitute an inequitable discrimination against other taxpayers similarly situated and would create an undesirable precedent which might encourage other taxpayers to seek relief in the same manner.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1958.

WPA AND PWA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal points out in a recent article that no American wants to return to the days of the WPA and PWA, and that while this was an unhappy period in American history, President Eisenhower, in a recent statement by him was unnecessarily harsh in criticizing the spirit behind these agencies.

The Milwaukee Journal has never been a New Deal paper. It has been extremely critical of many of the big Government, big brother implications of the New Deal. With a sense of fairness which has always characterized the Journal, however, it points out that many Americans have deep gratitude toward these New Deal agencies, which saved them from idleness and starvation, and provided in many cases a rich and invaluable investment in highways, bridges, libraries, schools, and erosion control and irrigation programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T BELITTLE WPA AND PWA

No American wants to return to the days of WPA or PWA. The very initials bring memories of an unhappy period in American history. Nevertheless, President Eisenhower was unnecessarily harsh in mention of WPA and PWA in his Saturday statement about the present recession.

Many Americans have a deep gratitude toward those New Deal agencies, which saved them from idleness and starvation. Furthermore, accomplishments of those depression-time, made-work programs are still with us today, 20 years after the agencies were liquidated.

What did the WPA (Works Progress Administration) and the PWA (Public Works Administration) do?

Between 1934 and 1943, the WPA and predecessor agencies pumped almost \$15 billion into the economy. Jobs were provided for more than 8 million Americans on 1½ million projects. There was some waste, some leaf raking. However, WPA contributed 643,000 miles of highways, roads, and streets; 77,000 bridges and viaducts; 54,000 new public buildings; 5,832 schools, libraries, auditoriums, and gymnasiums; 1,650 parks, 3,000 playgrounds; 285 new airports; 944 sewage treatment plants; and hundreds of flood and erosion control, irrigation, and conservation projects.

Here in Milwaukee, the WPA improved 900 miles of roads and streets, erected 43 bridges and viaducts, reconstructed 91 schools, installed 222 miles of street lighting, and built many miles of storm and sanitary sewers. WPA and CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps) labor developed and improved much of the county park system. It made Whitnall Estabrook, and Lincoln Parks the beauty spots they are.

The PWA constructed 34,524 projects, ranging in size from a 1-room school in Arizona to a \$60 million sewage disposal facility in Chicago. At its peak, it employed 650,000 men on construction sites and an estimated 1,200,000 off the sites. Total cost of PWA construction was \$6 billion, of which roughly a third was contributed by benefiting communities.

In the Milwaukee area, PWA helped build the filtration plant and the Cherry Street bridge, nearly \$4 million worth of school improvements, and \$3 million worth of sewer repairs and extensions. The Parklawn housing project was a PWA development. Most of the suburbs built schools, sewers, and streets with PWA aid.

To apply such words as "schemes" and "dubious activities" and "unsound" in blanket indictment of WPA and PWA seems uncalled for and unjustified.

It may be, of course, that Mr. Eisenhower didn't have an awareness of the need or accomplishment of WPA and PWA. All of that time he was sheltered in the Army, much of it serving as General MacArthur's aide in the far-off Philippines.

ECONOMIC DECLINE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, of course public officials do a great disservice to our country when they create a dangerous psychology of pessimism by exaggerating the seriousness of the economic decline.

On the other hand, they do a similar disservice by remaining silent or by exaggerating the optimistic trends in our economy.

I feel very strongly, Mr. President, that it is desirable for public officials to speak out and, on the basis of the most responsible and authoritative facts they can find, to indicate exactly what is the status of our economy. With this in mind, I call the attention of the Senate to two excellent articles which appeared recently. Mr. John G. Forrest, of the New York Times, reported yesterday that there are serious danger signals with regard to our Nation's economic health. The Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission have said, according to Forrest, that business spending this year would fall 13 percent, or \$5 billion below that of last year.

Forrest also reports that at the same time, the Federal Reserve Board describes in its latest survey of consumer spending a spreading pessimism about the economic outlook, and more seriously, a cutback by consumers in plans to buy major products. Forrest reports that home building last month dropped to the lowest annual rate since 1954. He calls attention to slumping exports and the prospect that these will be substantially below those of last year.

In a similar article by Mr. Harold B. Dorsey in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, Mr. Dorsey predicts that the annual rate of business capital expenditures for the first 6 months of this year is likely to show a year-to-year decline of at least \$6 billion, and expresses his personal opinion that the decline will be much larger. He also points to the drop in the annual rate of exports of from \$2 billion to \$3 billion a year below last year, and expresses concern that Government moves

will not be able to accomplish a sizable recovery in the level of business activity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the RECORD at this point following my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 16, 1958]

RECESSION NEWS ARRIVES PELLMELL, BUT MARKET PUSHES DOGGEDLY UPHILL

(By John G. Forrest)

The state of the Nation's economic health continued to dominate both domestic and foreign news last week. That state was definitely queasy, though nothing like a crisis had set in.

Surprisingly, the stock market shrugged off the continuing rash of gloomy news. It ended the week with a modest gain. The New York Times combined average of 50 stocks closed at 280.99, up 2 points. The gains in specialty issues were largely attributed to short covering.

Wall Street had its reasons. The bad news had been discounted well in advance and the statistics that now were being issued came as no surprise. Unemployment was expected to rise, and it did; corporate earnings for the fourth quarter of 1957 were expected to show declines, and they did; capital expenditures for plant and heavy equipment were expected to dip, and they are falling.

SIX AND SEVEN-TENTHS PERCENT IDLE

In mid-February, unemployment rose to 5,173,000, the highest level since August 1941, and a jump of 679,000 from the mid-January figure. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, pointed out that listing those on short workweeks would add another 1,300,000 to the total. As it was, the officially reported unemployment rate stood at 6.7 percent of the labor force.

President Eisenhower announced he would recommend that the Federal Government extend benefits to workers who had exhausted their State jobless payments. The program would cost \$600 million to \$800 million and temporarily extend jobless pay for 39 weeks from the 26 weeks now prevailing.

The Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission reported that business spending this year would fall 13 percent, or \$5 billion, from the record \$37 billion of 1957. The estimated decline is nearly double that predicted in surveys last fall.

At the same time, the Federal Reserve Board issued its latest survey of consumer spending plans. It showed a spreading pessimism about the economic outlook and, more significant, a cutback in plans to buy major products. Indications were that new-car sales would be hit—as they have been these last few months—and that there would be fewer buyers for new homes.

BUILDING DIP

Home building last month dropped to an annual rate of 890,000 starts, the lowest since 1954. As a rule, February heralds a seasonal upturn in home construction. This year, of course, the weather was unusually severe.

There are some who believe that slumping exports are a major contributing cause of the recession. Latest figures tend to bear them out. In January, overseas shipments were 10 percent below those of a year earlier. They fell 8 percent in December. The statistics in both months exclude military-aid shipments.

There was one thin ray of cheer, however, from the Washington statistical factory. The Federal Reserve Board said department-store sales in the first week this month ran 7 percent ahead of the like week last year. It was emphasized, though, that sales a year

ago were badly depressed by the weather. Also, Easter is 2 weeks earlier this year and traditional buying may be well under way.

ARMS STEP-UP

Slowly but surely, defense spending is beginning to pick up. In the first half of this year, procurement contracts are now scheduled to run at a rate of \$1.7 billion to \$1.8 billion a month, compared with about \$1 billion a month in the last half of 1957. The outlay for military construction in the first half will amount to about \$1.7 billion, against \$327 million in the final half of last year.

The Government soon will be back in the money market. The Treasury next month will seek \$3 billion in new cash. The terms have not yet been disclosed. The reason for the borrowing: Later this month the Government will have to pay off about \$3 billion in tax-anticipation notes issued last July.

IS THE RECESSION SLIDING INTO SOMETHING WORSE?

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

The apparent immunity of the stock market to very bad business news symbolizes Wall Street's interesting interpretation of the present business situation.

It is argued: "Everybody knows that business figures are bad. The worse they get, then the more pressure there is on the Federal Government to do something, and the palliatives administered by hysterical politicians will probably be of an inflationary character." Whenever speculators sense a revival of an inflationary atmosphere they tend to look with greater favor on common stocks.

In the presence of this rationale, a discussion of business statistics seems to have only the academic interest of a post mortem. In fact, however, a consideration of the business figures should have a real practical value, especially if one is willing in his diagnosis to clear his mind of the cloudy generalities and misconceptions about inflation.

So far as the business analyst is concerned, probably the most significant set of statistics recently released are those which indicate an acceleration in the downward trend of business capital expenditures. According to the joint report released last week by the Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission, capital expenditures by business in the third quarter of last year reached a peak of \$37.75 billion when the year-to-year gain was 5.2 percent. The revised figures for the fourth quarter of last year indicate that the scope of the year-to-year improvement had dropped to 0.6 percent. Now it is anticipated that capital expenditures for the first quarter of this year will show a year-to-year decline of 7.7 percent, for the second quarter the decline is expected to be 12 percent, and for the second half of this year it is anticipated that the annual rate of these expenditures will be \$6.1 billion below the same period of 1957, a decline of 16 percent.

These figures tend to confirm a study on the same subject prepared by the National Industrial Conference Board sponsored by Newsweek magazine. That study indicated that appropriations for capital expenditures by the large manufacturing companies in the fourth quarter of last year were down 33 percent from a year earlier and the backlog of unexpended appropriations on December 31 was 20 percent lower than a year before. These figures give a good idea of the actual capital expenditures by these companies 6 to 9 months later.

In this column on February 3 it was pointed out that business analysts would be watching carefully to see "whether the decline will continue into the stage where weakness breeds weakness." * * * Whatever the original reason for the first decline in the

volume of demand, the resulting deterioration in earnings has a further debilitating effect upon the demand for goods and services, which, in turn, is likely to cause a further drop in earnings."

Unquestionably, there is an association between the declining trend of business earnings and the declining—and accelerating—trend in business capital expenditures. Unfortunately, the latter trend has an adverse effect on job creation, which tends to reduce purchasing power and the ability to move goods at the consumption line.

It was officially reported last week that January exports recorded a 10 percent year-to-year decline. This tends to support an observation made in this column a few weeks ago that our export volume for this calendar year is likely to be \$2 billion below last year.

The University of Michigan Federal Reserve Board analysis of consumer attitudes revealed last week a marked rise in pessimism about the general outlook, with some curtailment of plans to buy major items as compared with a year ago at this time. This more conservative attitude on the part of the consumer is another evidence of weakness breeding weakness.

The figures on the total dollar volume for all types of retail sales for the month of February recorded a 3 percent decline from January (seasonally adjusted), and were 1 percent below February a year ago. The decline in physical volume in the past 12 months was, of course, greater than the 1 percent decline in dollar volume, because prices have increased by over 3 percent in the past year. Perhaps the February figure was a fluke because of the bad weather. In fact, February seasonally is one of the slowest months of the year for business as a whole. The seasonal impulses should now turn favorable, and this might help the figures and the psychology. However, the March figures had better record good gains over a year earlier or the implications will be bad.

This brief summary of some of the more significant business indicators has negative implications about the outlook, certainly appearing to justify an increasing concern about the possibility that the current recession is sliding into something worse. In line with the pattern of current Wall Street thinking, this condition enhances the prospect for lower taxes and higher Government expenditures.

But in appraising the effects of the various estimates of probable tax reductions and of increases in Government spending, we should have in mind the above-mentioned prospect that the annual rate of business capital expenditures 6 months from now is likely to be showing year-to-year declines of at least \$6 billion (it is my personal opinion that the decline will be larger). The annual rate of exports is likely to be running two to three billion dollars below last year and neither business nor the consumer seems to be in the mood to provide a satisfactory volume of demand at this price level.

The Government moves and the general ignorance about the subject of inflation may create some kind of inflationary psychology, but I can see some very good reasons for doubting that the Government moves will, in fact, be inflationary in terms of higher prices or even in terms of a sizable recovery in the level of business activity and employment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am an optimist. I believe that this Government can stop this economic downturn, and can do so promptly. I call the attention of the Senate to an article in yesterday's New York Times by Mr. Herbert Koshetz. He points out that on the one hand there is a school that thumps for more Government spending.

An equally vociferous group argues that a cut in the Federal income tax is the quickest way to create purchasing power. Mr. Koshetz asks why not try some of each? In the same issue of the New York Times Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., has a careful, well-organized article entitled "Cut Taxes or Spend? Answer To Be Both."

This morning Mr. Dale has a follow-up article in the New York Times entitled "Need for a Tax Cut Seen by Economists," in which Mr. Dale makes this extremely significant statement:

What do all the Presidential and Congressional antirecession actions add up to? A consensus of private economists here would go something like this:

All the items are useful, some more than others. But the whole package may not amount to much this year unless a tax cut is added.

Mr. Dale then makes an extremely careful analysis of the probable economic impact of each antirecession step which has been taken, or is likely to be taken by the Congress, including jobless pay, housing, highways, public works, defense and credit. It is on the basis of this analysis that Mr. Dale concludes that it is the consensus of economists that the whole package may not amount to much without a tax cut.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 16, 1958]

AN EXAMINATION OF COUNTERMEASURES AS RECESSION CONTINUES TO DEEPEN

(By Herbert Koshetz)

The debate in Washington on how to halt the recession has stirred echoes all over the land. It all goes to prove that fighting a recession is not a science but an art, and those who practice it aren't too sure of their skill.

Economists could easily draw upon their experience if they could pin down the exact cause. But no two recessions have produced the same set of statistics. Changed conditions create a lot of doubt on what are the best measures to be taken.

On one hand there is the school that thumps for more Government spending. An equally vociferous group argue that a cut in the Federal income tax is the quickest way to create purchasing power to pull out of the slump.

The casual observer is inclined to ask: Why not try some of each?

Fortunately, the Government is committed to a policy of full employment, and therefore it will act.

THE BAD NEWS

In the meantime, however, conditions tend to grow worse. Unemployment in February rose to more than 5,100,000, the highest in 16 years. Industrial production is expected to fall another 2 points to 131 percent of the 1947-49 average, the lowest point since December 1954.

Manufacturers' backlog of orders have been cut back, and even those companies that felt they could weather a long storm aren't quite so sure now. The National Industrial Conference Board last week reported that 3 out of 4 producers polled had reported their January 1958 orders well below those of 1 year previously. The average decline in new orders and billings, the conference board said, was 10 to 20 percent.

The board added, however, that most of the manufacturers surveyed were of the opinion that new orders had hit their low in the latter half of 1957 or would do so in the present quarter. One out of five showed gains in new orders and billings during January, as compared with January 1957.

ROUGH ON DURABLES

The hard-goods industries appear to have been hit the hardest. The conference board revealed that 84 percent of the metalworking companies had declines in new orders and 81 percent had lower billings. In the non-metal group, 58 percent reported lower orders and 61 percent lower billings.

This is no time to lose heart, particularly since seasonal factors should work in favor of both producers and distributors. There are areas in which improvement in weather will bring about an upturn, such as in housing starts.

January housing starts, incidentally, showed a marked improvement over the final months of 1957. But the ground gained in January was lost in February. It is hoped that spring will induce a revival.

Retail trade likewise lost ground in February, and the weather was largely to blame. An early Easter, however, will tend to stimulate apparel sales. In the fashion field there are basic style changes, such as the chemise dress, which are making themselves felt.

Actually, the chemise does not have universal acceptance among women shoppers. It has created a lot of discussion, however, and aroused curiosity among all classes of shoppers. If they haven't come to the stores to buy, at least they come to look, and the aggressive retailer has been able to capitalize on the increased traffic in the apparel department.

STYLE INFLUENCE

Women are slow to take up new styles that might be considered extreme. But if the styles catch on at higher price levels, they generally do well after adaptations have been made in the medium- and popular-price ranges. The style handle is still one of the strongest tools that apparel retailers have for maintaining volume.

From the retail standpoint, a tax cut would do much to boost morale. In Washington, one of the most popular plans is to raise the personal exemption from \$600 to \$700, saving wage earners and other taxpayers about \$2,800,000,000 a year.

And a moderate cut in taxes at the corporation level would prove beneficial also. It could well stem the decline in plant investment. It was estimated last fall that companies would be spending at an annual rate of \$37.5 billion for new plant and equipment during the fourth quarter of 1957. Actually, their rate of spending was at least \$2 billion below that. And the recession has brought a deep cut in estimates for the first quarter of 1958. These estimates had been reduced in the light of cutbacks on expansion plans. Now they are in for further reductions.

IMPACT OF EXPORTS

A decline in exports as revealed by the latest figures is also a matter of concern. In January, the United States exported \$1,403,000,000 worth of goods, exclusive of military shipments. This was 10 percent below shipments in January last year.

It is recalled that in the recession of 1953-54, one of the factors that aided recovery was the rising trend of shipments abroad. But the Nation's economy now will not have that assistance, mainly because European countries are undergoing a gradual softening of the boom they enjoyed in the last 2 years.

If the United States suffers a loss of 10 percent in exports for 1958 as a whole, sales abroad will be \$2.6 billion less than they were last year. If the loss could be kept

down, it would mean less dislocation to the economy. But to keep exports at a high figure, the United States has no alternative but to accept a goodly amount of imports.

And this spells out why there should be no hesitation in renewing the reciprocal trade program in a manner that makes it possible for foreign countries to maintain their markets here.

[From the New York Times of March 16, 1958]

CUT TAXES OR SPEND? ANSWER TO BE BOTH—CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATION WORK ON A PACKAGE PROGRAM

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—The politics of fighting the recession—much like the politics of reacting to the Soviet missile-satellite threat—appears to have produced an extraordinary result: More agreement than disagreement about what to do.

This has major consequences for the economy. If Government actions can help, as almost all economists think they can, they can help best if they are taken quickly. And they could never be taken quickly in a divided government with one party running Congress battling the other party running the executive.

At the end of this week, the degree of harmony and sweet reasonableness seemed dazzling:

Item. Both the President and the Congressional Democratic leadership were clearly in agreement that the next major weapon to be fired is a tax cut.

Item. There were strong indications that the proposed administration tax bill would be along much the same lines as a bill being worked up by leading Democratic Congressional tax writers.

Item. Republicans voted unanimously for the big Democratic housing bill in the Senate, after the Democrats in the banking committee had compromised their bill somewhat to meet Republican demands.

PRACTICALLY UNANIMOUS

Item. All but one Republican in the Senate and all of the Republicans on the House Public Works Committee voted for the Democratic resolutions urging a speeding of public-works projects already under way. The President had already ordered a partial speedup.

Item. Both the President and the Democratic Congressional leaders are agreed on the need for an emergency bill to extend unemployment-compensation benefits, though they differ on details.

Item. The President and the leaders also quickly settled on the device of a stepped-up highway program, though again they disagreed on some important details. All of the Republicans on the Senate Public Works Subcommittee voted for the compromise bill.

All this does not mean that politics has suddenly vanished from the scene. An explanation of the situation might go something like this:

The Democrats count, to begin with, on the recession itself to help them in the next election. Under the disaffection theory of politics, what matters is the performance and results produced by the "ins" rather than the proposals of the "outs." The Republicans will be blamed for the recession, even if it is cured rather quickly.

The Democrats will be able to orate about the recession in the election—just as much as if they had tried to engineer a completely Democratic package of solutions.

Furthermore, most of the top Democratic leaders in Congress have become convinced of the responsibility theory of how to win elections. Under this theory, the worst thing the Democratic opposition could do in a condition of emergency—sputnik or economic—would be to balk the response of the administration to the situation.

Men like LYNDON JOHNSON and SAM RAYBURN are understood to be genuinely convinced that the vast middle group of Americans would give the Democrats far more credit for helping the administration than for appearing to ride off on a program of their own—always provided the Democrats add a little extra to each administration proposal to give it something of an opposition flavor.

And, finally, Messrs. JOHNSON and RAYBURN are working hard to make a Democratic record of their own—a record whose key descriptive word is speed. They have galvanized Congress into a pace of action almost unheard of for this stage of the session. And in some instances they have beaten the administration to the punch with actual proposals, the chief item to date being housing.

ECONOMICS AFTER POLITICS

If this explains the political paradox, it leaves two other major related questions:

How does the package stack up economically? And will the package work?

Economists can disagree about the right medicine for recessions just as much as ordinary citizens. For the first few months of the recession, there emerged a natural debate over the relative merits of more Federal spending and tax cuts.

Time and events have rendered the argument at this stage almost academic. There are two main reasons:

(1) The final package is clearly going to involve some of both. Spending on roads, unemployment compensation, public works, defense and housing will inevitably rise slowly, but over the next 15 months it will be some undetermined but significant amount, upward of \$1 billion, higher than was projected when the President submitted his budget in January.

As for the tax cut, it will take an unlikely surge of pep in the economy this month to avert it. It is by all odds the most powerful weapon in the package, and the chances now are strong that it will be used.

(2) The recession—certainly in the sense of unemployment—gathered force rather more rapidly than was foreseen when the spending versus tax-cut debate was being conducted in January and early February. The same economist who argued at the turn of the year that it was far better to spend more on such things as education or hospitals than to cut taxes might well be ready to go along with a tax cut now because of the need for speed.

The administration and the Congressional Democrats appear to have picked out most of the spending items that can be stepped up reasonably quickly. A big school-building program aided by Federal funds, as an example, could not possibly get rolling for a full year. So any economist who agrees that massive Federal antirecession action is necessary is almost forced to agree at this stage that a tax cut is the next item.

MODERN THEORY APPLIED

The package as a whole reflects rather precisely the modern "compensatory" theory of combatting the business cycle. By more spending or by tax cuts or both, the Government, according to this theory, is supposed to incur a large budget deficit and thereby to supply the extra demand that is missing from the private sector.

The compensatory theory is not universally accepted, but its acceptance is far greater today—particularly after the writings of the late John Maynard Keynes in the late 1930's—than it was during the great depression.

In general, then it can be said that the majority of economists would accept the propriety and desirability of the package that is emerging. But the opposition is not negligible.

The opposition is of two types. Among many conservatives—the editorial page of

the Wall Street Journal is a good example—the compensatory idea has never been accepted. This school doubts that big anti-recession deficits will work to restore full employment and is convinced that they will only have the ultimate effect of further diluting the value of the dollar.

This school is much more strongly represented in Congress than the recent performance would indicate. But the conservative school has simply been swept along with the antirecession tide.

THREAT OF INFLATION

The other type of opposition, also among conservatives, accepts compensatory action as the right medicine, and medicine that will work. But it doubts that the recession has reached the stage where a major attack is necessary. This school—which includes some important people in the administration and Federal Reserve System as well as private businessmen and economists—fears that a too early and too strong onslaught on the recession will turn the economy around so drastically that inflation of a serious nature will be upon us again.

Under this line of thought, excessive anti-recession action just postpones the day of reckoning. A new, artificial boom will be created, only to give way to really major collapse later.

It is important to distinguish between these two forms of opposition. The latter group has no doubts that the antirecession deficit will work; it merely fears that the deficit will work too well. Will it?

DEFICIT FORESEEN

The prevailing view among economists, it seems safe to say, is that it will—that is, a deficit of the order of \$10 billion, which will be almost inevitable if the tax-cut weapon is added to the spending package already in the works. There is considerable skepticism, however, that the spending measure alone will have much economic impact.

Most economists, in fact, would probably go so far as to say a deficit of this magnitude—with its multiplier effect of perhaps another \$10 billion in addition to the original sum—would work even if general psychology remains pessimistic while the Government actions are taking hold.

With the package now nearly inevitable, we shall soon know. The year 1958, in many respects, is providing the great test by fire of modern economic theory.

[From the New York Times of March 17, 1958]

NEED FOR A TAX CUT SEEN BY ECONOMISTS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 16.—What do all the Presidential and Congressional antirecession actions add up to? A consensus of private economists here would go something like this:

All the items are useful, some more than others. But the whole package may not amount to much this year unless a tax cut is added.

Following is a rundown of the probable impact, as seen by experts here, of the various measures, other than a tax cut, that have been proposed:

JOBLESS PAY

The measure to extend the duration of unemployment compensation benefits is probably the most important item in the package proposed to date. No good spending estimate can be made until it is known what the final bill will provide, but spending could easily come to \$1,200,000,000.

What is more, this will be the earliest spending of all the items in the package. It could start almost within a week after passage of the legislation.

However, there is one important qualification. This measure would not add to incomes and spending, but would merely pre-

vent a threatened decline. In short, it cannot be an upward force by itself.

HOUSING

The array of administrative and legislative actions is extremely complicated. But housing experts appear agreed on one generalization about the whole group, including the \$1,850,000,000 Democratic bill moving through Congress:

The actions are helpful, but they will not mean a big upsurge in housing starts while people are uncertain about the future.

Only restored confidence will spur home sales and home starts in a significant degree, according to this opinion. The point is stressed that the measures are aimed at bolstering private, not Government-built, housing. To quote one expert:

"A builder doesn't start a house unless he thinks he can sell it."

Nonetheless, there is some hope that the measure will, at least, lead to some revival of the veterans housing program.

HIGHWAYS

The trouble here is that it is difficult to spend money fast. The bill moving through Congress, despite its multi-billion-dollar price tag, would mean a maximum of only \$800 million—and probably considerably less—of new contracts placed by the States in this calendar year. Most of that would be let in the last half of the year.

The \$800 million is not, of course, a negligible item. But even that much would provide a maximum of only 100,000 jobs in direct roadbuilding and supplying industries, according to one rule-of-thumb formula.

PUBLIC WORKS

So far the amounts involved are small. Under proposals backed by the administration and Congressional leaders, probably no more than \$300 million additional will be spent this calendar year. This includes water projects, hospitals, flood control, etc.

DEFENSE

This is the most difficult item to evaluate. There will be a large increase in placement of defense orders in the February-June period compared to the previous 7 months—about \$2,300 million a month compared to \$1,050 million.

However, this is somewhat deceptive. Much of the increase is merely to make up for the slow rate of ordering last summer, when the Government was making an effort at an economy drive.

Defense spending will rise somewhat during calendar year 1958, but not nearly so much as the figures on orders would indicate. The annual rate of spending is now estimated at only about \$2 billion higher in the last half of this year than in the first half.

Finally, there is some doubt that the Pentagon will be able to pump out the contracts at the planned rates. This doubt has been implicitly acknowledged by the Secretary of Defense, Neil H. McElroy.

The defense step-up is a help. The question is whether it will be enough to offset downward forces in the private economy.

CREDIT

There has long been debate in economic circles over the effectiveness of making money easier during slumps. Monetary policy is often compared to a man and a string—he can pull it but he cannot push it.

The point is that easier money does not help if the private economy does not generate willing and worthy borrowers. To date, bank loans have been declining despite easier money. However, it is generally accepted that the easy money policy of the Federal Reserve System did play an important role in helping the economy out of the 1953-54 recession.

There is little disposition among economists here to sneer at the antirecession

efforts made by the administration and Congress. There is considerable praise for the speed at which the cumbersome machinery of Government has gone into action.

There are of course some economists in and out of Government who believe that the economy will recover within 6 months of its own accord.

But whether a person thinks that Government action is imperative or not, there is some doubt that the measures in the works will have a major impact on the economy. That is another reason why the betting here places heavy odds on the likelihood of a tax cut, and a big one.

THIS IS NOT THE TIME TO INCREASE INTEREST RATES ON HOUSING MORTGAGES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the recent debate in the Senate concerning the interest rate for veterans' housing, Republican Senators who favored increasing the interest rate contended that was necessary in order to persuade capital to invest in GI housing mortgages. At that time some of us disputed that contention.

Mr. President, an article written by Mr. Albert L. Kraus and published yesterday in the New York Times bears importantly on this issue. Mr. Kraus indicates how increased savings deposits present a banking problem. With a decline in business loans, new investment sources are needed. Investment money is aggressively and eagerly seeking new sources of investment.

In the course of the article, Mr. Alfred J. Casazza, executive vice president of the Savings Bank Trust Co., of New York, is quoted as telling the American Bankers' Association that:

The dynamic factor in the supply of investment funds is the transformation of commercial banks into aggressive buyers of securities and aggressive mortgage lenders.

Mr. President, this article provides strong documentary support for the Democratic position that this is not the time to increase interest rates. I call the article to the attention of the Senate in the hope that it will help forestall the taking of any similar action during the rest of this session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVINGS NOW POSE BANKING PROBLEM—WITH A DECLINE IN BUSINESS LOANS, NEW INVESTMENT SOURCES NEEDED—RATE DIP ALSO POSSIBLE—COMMERCIAL INSTITUTIONS ARE FACING BIGGEST DIFFICULTY WITH GAIN IN DEPOSITS

(By Albert L. Kraus)

Commercial banks, which took the lead in the race for savings deposits for the first time last year, face an uncomfortable prospect.

Because of the decline in business borrowing and a possible drop in rates, they must find other sources of investment at returns high enough to sustain the present level of interest payments, or cut the rate to savings depositors.

A cut in the savings rate would mean abandoning the measure of competitive equality the commercial banks have strug-

gled to obtain with the mutual thrift institutions—the savings banks and savings and loan associations.

The commercial bankers have given no indication of surrendering easily. A recent survey by the American Bankers Association showed that commercial bankers will spend 28 percent more on advertising this year than in 1957. Once again first emphasis will be given to savings.

"More and more bankers are convinced that the extensive savings campaign of last year, which helped to boost savings so high, should be waged with just as much vigor in 1958," the association said. A principal reason is that savings depositors become prospects for a commercial bank's other services.

DEPOSITS RAISED LAST YEAR

In last year's drive, commercial banks increased their time deposits \$5.4 billion to \$56 billion, a gain more than twice that of 1956. In comparison, savings banks increased their deposits \$1.6 billion to \$31.6 billion, and savings and loan associations their share accounts \$4.8 billion to \$41.9 billion. Life insurance policy reserves rose \$4.3 billion to \$83.4 billion. The increase was less last year than in 1956 in all classes of institutions except the commercial banks.

A primary factor was the increase in savings rates. Commercial banks across the Nation increased their rates during the year.

In New York State, for instance, 3 out of 4 commercial banks paid less than 2½ percent at the start of the year. By the end, the proportion was reversed. Of 421 New York State commercial banks surveyed recently, 331 were paying 2½ to 3 percent on savings.

So far this year there has been no indication of any slowdown in the growth of commercial bank savings deposits. To the contrary, along with the mutual thrift institutions, the commercial banks report an upturn.

New savings have continued to increase, but the major gain has resulted from a significant decline in withdrawals. Fear of the possible extent of the recession and buyer hesitancy to purchase durable goods are cited as explanations.

Howard D. Crosse, assistant vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, says the downturn in short-term interest rates should pose no special problem for the commercial bank that shifted last year—when it raised its saving rate—to higher yielding investments.

Some, in areas that would support such activity, increased their mortgage and consumer lending. Others took losses in their bond accounts to obtain higher yielding Governments, corporates and municipals.

Because of the reverse in the pattern of interest rates, some of these banks already have been able to take profits this year.

Not all commercial banks, however, were able or willing to subject themselves to the necessary self-discipline.

Alfred J. Casazza, executive vice president of the Savings Bank Trust Co., said that despite the big gain in savings last year, overall commercial bank mortgage and security holdings increased only slightly. He told American Bankers Association's 55th annual savings and mortgage conference:

"The dynamic factor in the supply of investment funds is the transformation of commercial banks into aggressive buyers of securities and aggressive mortgage lenders."

From mid-November, when the Federal Reserve announced its first reduction in the discount rate, until the end of February, business loans of weekly reporting member banks declined \$1.4 billion, while investments by these banks increased \$2.7 billion, he said.

"So long as the demand for business and consumer loans lags, commercial banks will be under constant pressure to sustain earnings by expanding investments," he added.

The Chase Manhattan Bank's decision to resume warehousing of Government guaranteed and insured mortgages after a 2-year hiatus probably result in part at least from this pressure.

Chase Manhattan scored the largest savings gain among New York City banks last year. Its savings deposits rose 82 percent to \$418 million.

In addition to shifting to higher yielding investments, commercial banks can effect economies by cutting expenses. A large New York City bank recently asked its branch managers to attempt to weed out low-balance savings accounts and accounts with much activity, two of the chief causes of higher operating expenses.

A recent cost study by a large thrift institution showed that a balance of \$211 was needed merely to break even on the paper work and overhead, and a balance of \$2,300 to pay the current dividend.

BASIS FOR OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED REDUCTION OF PRICE SUPPORTS FOR DAIRY COMMODITIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, only 15 days remain until the order by Secretary Benson to slash the price supports for dairy commodities is scheduled to take effect.

Mr. President, no other issue is of more urgent interest to the people of Wisconsin—not only to her dairy farmers, but also to her small-business men, professional people, working people, civic leaders, and Government officials. The prosperity of Wisconsin's dairy industry is as essential to the economy of Wisconsin as is the prosperity of agriculture generally to the prosperity of the Nation. The people of Wisconsin hail the action taken last week by this body, when it passed the joint resolution to maintain farm price supports at the 1957 level until improved legislation can be enacted by Congress. They hope the other House will see fit to join in the passage of the resolution.

Unfortunately, a great deal of misinformation has been given to many of our citizens who are not personally familiar with the facts about our farm situation. One of the most prevalent errors is the notion that the farmers who are in economic difficulty are engaged in small, inefficient operations.

According to the Department of Agriculture, dairy farmers in eastern Wisconsin in 1956 received on their labor returns of only 43 cents an hour. Mr. President, I should like to emphasize that the average dairy farmer in that region is not a marginal operator. He is one of the most efficient, most highly productive farmers in the entire world.

Mr. President, the following additional figures provided by the Department of Agriculture describe the scale of the average dairy operation in that section of Wisconsin:

The average dairy farmer there has a total investment of \$33,770 in his dairy operation. He milks 20 cows and raises 25 hogs; and the farmer and his family provide almost 90 percent of the total labor on the farm. Only about 9 percent is hired.

He is a substantial buyer of industrial products. His biggest single expense is for machinery. The average farm has

two tractors, and the average farmer spends nearly \$2,000 each year for farm machinery. He spends \$802 for purchased feed; \$216 for fertilizer and lime; \$405 for fencing materials and farm buildings. His total expenses—most of which constitute a market for products of nonagricultural, manufacturing industries—total \$4,658 a year.

These statistics apply to the average farm operator, Mr. President, who receives for his labor a return of only 43 cents an hour.

He is a heavy payer of taxes. His tax bills each year amount to \$369. Who can point out any other group, Mr. President, whose tax payments amount to such a crushing burden on an income of only 43 cents an hour?

This average Wisconsin dairy farmer, Mr. President, has greatly improved both his efficiency and his productivity in the past 10 years. But his returns have dropped. He has been punished—instead of rewarded—for his efficiency and his increasing contribution to our standard of living.

If the change proposed by Mr. Benson is allowed to go into effect, further punishment will be imposed upon these farm families for their contribution to the prosperity and the strength of America. Mr. Benson's order is unfair; it is cruel; it is unwise. It endangers the economic security of hundreds of thousands of loyal, hardworking Americans; and it threatens to undermine the entire national economy. If Mr. Benson's order is permitted to go into effect, it will give the economy a dangerous shove toward the disaster of a major, nationwide depression.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HEAD- QUARTERS FOR NATIONAL SO- CIETY OF SONS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the purpose of H. R. 9271, which now is on the calendar, is to permit the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to occupy the residence at 2412 Massachusetts Avenue as the national headquarters of the society. The society was given a charter by act of Congress 51 years ago to have its headquarters in Washington, D. C.

The Society of the Sons of the American Revolution is a leading, patriotic organization, nonprofit, nonsectarian, and nonpolitical. It is devoted to the support of the Constitution of the United States. It teaches the history of the founding of the Nation. It inculcates and stimulates love of our country and the flag and loyalty to our Government. This the society does by giving cash prizes and medals to students for good citizenship, as judged by teachers and student bodies. Cash prizes are given to student winners of historical orations in State and National contests. The local societies give medals to the outstanding members of the local ROTC. The local societies urge the teaching of American history in schools and colleges, and some of them give scholarships.

The adult population is influenced patriotically by the holding of commemorative exercises on the birthdays of patriots and on the anniversaries of the 4th of July, Constitution Day, and Flag Day. Annually, the governor of each State is requested to issue a proclamation for the observance of Constitution Day within his State.

None of this work with the schools and the public is done by or from the national headquarters. Instead, it is done by the local societies. The national headquarters is used to house a voluminous library which the national society's genealogist uses to verify and confirm the applications made for membership. It is used to house the records of membership. The membership is made up of distinguished leaders in the Senate and House of Representatives, governors of States, and leaders in the professions, education, and business.

When the present owner of 2412 Massachusetts Avenue applied for a variation in the zoning, to permit occupancy by the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, a few citizens in that part of the city objected, on the grounds of noise and increase of traffic. The building is to be used as the residence of the national executive secretary. In the building during the day, there will be, also, the genealogist, two secretaries, and the telephone operator. Of these five persons, the executive secretary, only, uses an automobile. Twice a year there will be a trustees' meeting. Conventions are held in hotels in cities throughout the United States. So in the headquarters building there will be very little noise, and the traffic will be very light, when compared with traffic in the same block going to the Mexican delegation offices and to and from the huge Canadian office building. In the block immediately to the west there are two large apartment houses; the Japanese and Indian Embassies are between them; and there are also the Spanish Embassy commercial attaché offices. In the block to the east there are the embassies of Denmark, Ecuador, China, and Korea; also a private school, and the Fellowship House, Inc., offices. This side of Massachusetts Avenue is not in the restricted residential A zone but is in the third category of residential zone known as BR, which permits row houses and community or apartment houses.

The building at 2412 Massachusetts Avenue contains 10 rooms and servants' quarters. Its size is suitable and ample for the home of the national society. It has a plain and dignified appearance. There is no need or desire to change the external appearance of the building, and there is little need for change inside. The use of the headquarters is of a quiet, conservative, and residential character. Many residents of the neighborhood have written, to the Board of Zoning Adjustment, letters favoring the society's occupancy. The adjacent owners on each side of the building welcome the society there, so they have stated in letters.

The President of the Board of District Commissioners for the District of Columbia has written to the chairmen of the District of Columbia Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, letters in which he states that the occupancy of the building by the Sons of the

American Revolution will have no adverse effect on the neighboring property and that "they (the Commissioners) do not offer objection to passage of the bill."

Mr. President, the bill was supposed to be reached during call of the calendar today. However, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] promised a resident of the District of Columbia that he would object. That resident stated that the headquarters could secure a building for possibly \$60,000 or thereabouts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia informs me that he was under the impression that the headquarters to be obtained would be used by the local chapter in the District of Columbia; he did not know it would be used by the national headquarters. However, since he promised to object to consideration of the bill during the call of the calendar today, he has requested that the bill not be considered today.

Out of courtesy to the Senator from Virginia, I shall not attempt to have the bill considered today. But I desire to give notice that on tomorrow I expect to ask that the bill be acted on by the Senate. There is a time limit in connection with this matter, inasmuch as the national headquarters has sold the building it formerly occupied, and it is necessary that arrangements be made promptly to obtain another building for the national headquarters.

I may say that, as a result of the proposed exchange, the national organization will be able to accumulate a reserve of approximately \$100,000, which is badly needed for its work.

I am very anxious to have the bill passed, and to have the national headquarters accommodated in this manner. I am quite confident the Congress will act wisely in this connection.

GOVERNORS' INTERSTATE INDIAN COUNCIL—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the agenda and list of 12 resolutions passed by the Governors' Interstate Indian Council at their 10th annual meeting held at Oklahoma City, Okla., on October 24, 25, 26, 1957. The great State of North Dakota is one of the States represented in the Governors' Interstate Indian Council and the Honorable John B. Hart, executive director of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission, was one of the speakers at this conference. I further ask that his remarks be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNORS' INTERSTATE INDIAN COUNCIL

K. W. Bergan, chairman, State Capitol, Helena, Mont.

Francis McKinley, vice chairman, Fort Duchesne, Utah.

John Shaw, secretary; Burbank, Okla.
Directors: Harold Farley, Boise, Idaho; Paul Jones, Windowrock, Ariz.; N. B. Johnson, Oklahoma City, Okla.; A. H. Wright, Salem, Oreg.; S. C. DeMers, Butte, Mont.

States represented: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

AGENDA, 10TH ANNUAL MEETING, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., OCTOBER 24, 25, 26, 1957

October 24

8 a. m.: Registration of official delegates, Blue Room, State Capitol.

9 a. m.: Conference called to order, K. W. Bergan, chairman, presiding.

9 a. m.: Invocation, Dr. Charles E. Webber.

9:10 a. m.: Address of welcome, Hon. N. B. Johnson, Supreme Court Judge, State of Oklahoma.

9:20 a. m.: Greetings and presentation of flowers, by Mrs. A. B. Cockrell, vice president, State Federation of Women's Clubs.

9:30 a. m.: Response to the Welcome, Maurice Powers, of Washington.

10 a. m.: Objectives and functions of the council, John Hart, North Dakota.

10:20 a. m.: History and accomplishments of the council, A. H. Wright, Oregon.

10:40 a. m.: Panel discussion—State problems from impacts of Indian people.

Hon. N. B. Johnson, Oklahoma, leader.

Discussants: A. H. Wright, Oregon; W. W. Hill, New Mexico; Fern Wanek, South Dakota; James Mosier, Colorado; Charles F. Miller, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.; Forrest Gerard, Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.; Miss Selene Gifford, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.

Recess for lunch.

1:30 p. m.: Panel discussion—Relocation and industrialization programs from the State point of view.

Hon. N. B. Johnson, Oklahoma, leader.

Discussants: Harley Fletcher, South Dakota; Pete Shepherd, Kansas; Maurice Powers, Washington; Clarence Wesley, Arizona; George Keith, Wisconsin; Clifford Rucker, Minnesota; Gordon Ibbotson, Colorado; Charles F. Miller, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.; John Hart, North Dakota, summarizer.

3:30 p. m.: Panel discussion—Law and order in Indian country, State and Federal cooperation.

George Smith, Minnesota, leader.

Discussants: Gordon Dickie, Wisconsin; Lewis B. Holt, Idaho; William H. Kelly, Arizona; Patrick Gourneau, North Dakota; Miss Selene Gifford, Bureau of Indian Affairs, summarizer.

7:30 p. m.: Report of nominating committee—Chairman Fern Wanek, Hon. N. B. Johnson, Harold Farley, James Mosier, and Warren Emm.

8 p. m.: Panel discussion—Problems on welfare assistance for people of Indian blood. Walter W. Broemer, Texas, leader.

Discussants: Raymond Thacker, Nevada; Clyde Edmonds, Utah; Vidal Ballard, Idaho; George Keith, Wisconsin; Selene Gifford, Washington, D. C.; Maurice Powers, Washington, summarizer.

October 25, 1957

8:30 a. m.: Panel discussion—State and Federal cooperation in vocational education, higher education, public education, and secondary education.

Harold Farley, Idaho, leader.

Discussants: Harvey Wright, Oregon; John Artichoker, South Dakota; Warren Emm, Nevada; Walter W. Broemer, Texas; George Smith, Minnesota; James Mosier, Colorado; Selene Gifford, Washington, D. C.; Fern Wanek, South Dakota, summarizer.

10:30 a. m.: Report by States—Termination of supervision.

George Keith, Wisconsin leader.

Alex Miller, Oregon. Roundtable discussion.

Recess for lunch.

1:30 p. m.: Miscellaneous problems.

3:30 p. m.: Resolutions—Report of resolutions committee: George Keith, Wisconsin; A. H. Wright, Oregon; Hon. N. B. Johnson, Oklahoma; John Hart, North Dakota; Clarence Wesley, Arizona; James Mosier, Colorado.

5:30 p. m.: Election of officers.

7 p. m.: Dinner meeting—Guest speakers: Dr. Angie Debo, University of Oklahoma; Hon. Ed Edmondson, Congressman from Oklahoma.

RESOLUTIONS—GOVERNORS' INTERSTATE INDIAN COUNCIL, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., OCTOBER 24, 25, 26

Resolution No. I

Whereas a high proportion of admissions to Indian hospitals and related medical facilities is due to illness which is predominantly resultant from unsanitary conditions due primarily to inadequate and unprotected water supplies and inadequate facilities for disposal of human waste and related environmental factors; and

Whereas the use of open surface and unprotected well-water sources of supply is to be found in some areas, and hauling of water for domestic use distances of 1 to 10 miles is a common practice on many reservations; and

Whereas promiscuous disposal of human wastes or use of totally inadequate privy facilities are found in some areas, with resultant fly problems and high incidence of diarrhea and dysentery; and

Whereas H. R. 246, H. R. 2894, and S. 1493 of the 85th Congress, known as the sanitation facilities bills, sponsored by the Public Health Service, embody principles and provisions which, if enacted into law, will greatly aid the Public Health Service in remedying these conditions and improve the health of Indians: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Governors' Interstate Indian Council in session at Oklahoma City, Okla., on this the 25th day of October 1957, reaffirms its recommendation and endorsement of the principles incorporated in these sanitation bills and urge that every effort be made to bring about the enactment of this legislation in the next session of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Surgeon General of the United States and appropriate Congressional committees dealing with this type of legislation.

Resolution No. II

Whereas, based on the reports of the staff of the Division of Indian Health, the Governor's Interstate Indian Council is of the opinion that satisfactory progress has been made in improving both medical and public-health services provided for Indians during the 2 years of its administration of the Indian health program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Governors' Interstate Indian Council endorse in full the recommendations of the Surgeon General to the Congress for funds for the operation of Indian health programs for the fiscal year 1958. While many improvements have been made during the past 2 years in the expansion of health services for Indians under the administration of the Public Health Service, the Governors' Interstate Indian Council is of the opinion that increasing appropriations should be made by the Congress from year to year until the standard of Indian health has been brought to the same standards of other racial groups.

Resolution No. III

Be it resolved, That the President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget be prevailed upon and urged to release the

frozen funds provided for the construction of hospitals in those areas where the need is most urgent.

Resolution No. IV

Whereas the Governor of Oklahoma has extended to the Governors' Interstate Indian Council the privilege of using the Blue Room adjacent to the Governor's office; and Whereas the council deeply appreciates this courtesy: Be it

Resolved, That the council extends its thanks to Governor Gary for the courtesy so extended.

Resolution No. V

Be it resolved by the Governors' Interstate Indian Council, That it extend its thanks and appreciation to the press and TV for the publicity it has given this conference, and for the many other courtesies shown the council.

Resolution No. VI

Whereas the Oklahoma State Federation of Women's Clubs has presented to this council a beautiful bouquet of flowers; and

Whereas the council is desirous to extend its sincere appreciation for the courtesy so extended; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the council go on record as thanking the Oklahoma State Federation of Women's Clubs for the beautiful bouquet; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to Mrs. Charles Strother, president, Oklahoma State Federation of Women's Clubs, 811 West Taliaferro Street, Madill, Okla.; Mrs. G. E. Haslam, chairman, Oklahoma State Federation of Women's Clubs, Indian Affairs division, Anadarko, Okla.; and Mrs. Beulah Richardson, president, M'Ahote Club, 1016 NE. 15th, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Resolution No. VII

Be it resolved, That the Governors' Interstate Indian Council express its thanks and appreciation to Mrs. Hallie Johnson, 311 NW. 22d, Oklahoma City; Mrs. Lena Holloway, Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce; and the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce for the fine assistance they rendered the council during its session.

Resolution No. VIII

Whereas the Governors' Interstate Indian Council is cognizant of the many and varied problems that face our Indian citizens; and

Whereas various State agencies have been striving to develop industries and programs so as to raise the economic and social levels of our Indian citizens; and

Whereas said States through their agencies have worked diligently in behalf of the indigent Indian citizen to raise their standards of living; and

Whereas said States have found that the path between reservation and integration is strewn with many obstacles difficult to surmount, and with the financial needs rising above all others; and

Whereas said States are trying to solve these financial problems and have tried to cooperate with the Federal Government and work out an equitable program of financial responsibility but have not been able to find solid ground upon which to stand in the matter of financial responsibility between the Federal Government and the States because no fixed legislation sets forth where Federal financial responsibility ends and State responsibility begins; and

Whereas said States have found only a very flexible Bureau of Indian Affairs policy in this matter of where Federal financial responsibility ends and where State financial responsibility begins: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress be urged to enact legislation defining just when Federal financial responsibility ends and when State financial responsibility begins in their efforts to raise the economic and social levels of our Indian citizens.

Resolution No. IX

Be it resolved by the Governors' Interstate Indian Council, That the complete costs of any termination programs be borne by the Federal Government.

Resolution No. X

Be it resolved, That the Governors' Interstate Indian Council go on record wholeheartedly supporting the industrial development program now being sponsored by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and that adequate appropriations be made to carry out an aggressive program of encouraging such industrial development on or adjacent to Indian reservations and where economically feasible; and be it further

Resolved, That this council support the relocation program where there is a lack of economic opportunity among the Indian tribes.

Resolution No. XI

Be it resolved by the Governors' Interstate Indian Council, That the Congress be memorialized to provide adequate appropriations for Indian scholarships.

Resolution No. XII

Be it resolved by the Governors' Interstate Indian Council, That Dr. William Kelly, the delegate from the State of Arizona, be designated by the council to investigate the feasibility of a permanent secretary and report to the executive committee before the next regular meeting of the council.

Delegates: William H. Kelly, Arizona; James R. Mosler, Colorado; Gordon M. Ibbotson, Colorado; John Artchoker, Jr., South Dakota; F. R. Wanek, South Dakota; Harold Farley, Idaho; Vidal Ballard, Idaho; Lewis B. Holt, Idaho; George A. Smith, Minnesota; Clifford E. Rucker, Minnesota; K. W. Bergan, Montana; Raymond Thacker, Nevada; W. H. Clasby, Oklahoma; N. B. Johnson, Oklahoma; Warren Emm, Nevada; W. W. Hill, New Mexico; Patrick Gourneau, North Dakota; John B. Hart, North Dakota; A. H. Wright, Oregon; Ayex D. Miller, Oregon; Walt Broemer, Texas; Mrs. Doris Sylvestine, Texas; Clyde C. Edmonds, Utah; Maurice E. Powers, Washington; George M. Keith, Wisconsin; Gordon Dickie, Wisconsin; Clarence Wesley, Arizona; Pete W. Shepherd, Kansas.

Consultants: Miss Selene Gifford, Bureau of Indian Affairs; Charles F. Miller, Bureau of Indian Affairs; Forrest Gerard, Public Health Service; Harley Fletcher, State Planning Board of South Dakota.

HISTORY OF PREVIOUS CONFERENCES

First national meeting, St. Paul, Minn., 1949.

Second national meeting, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1949, Jarle Lierfallom, Minnesota, chairman.

Third national meeting, Oklahoma City, Okla., 1950, Jarle Lierfallom, Minnesota, chairman.

Fourth national meeting, Helena, Mont., 1951, Jarle Lierfallom, Minnesota, chairman.

Fifth national meeting, Phoenix, Ariz., 1952, Alva A. Simpson, New Mexico, chairman.

Sixth national meeting, Carson City, Nev., 1953, Allan P. Jeffries, Idaho, chairman.

Seventh national meeting, Sun Valley, Idaho, 1954, Allan P. Jeffries, Idaho, chairman.

Eighth national meeting, Santa Fe, N. Mex., 1955, A. H. Wright, Oregon, chairman.

Ninth national meeting, Sheridan, Wyo., 1956, Steve DeMers, Montana, chairman.

Tenth national meeting, Oklahoma City, Okla., 1957, K. W. Bergan, Montana, chairman.

OBJECTIVES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL
(By John Hart, North Dakota)

Gentlemen, I now feel like a real enrolled member of an Indian tribe. I was not consulted when assigned this topic.

Tradition is that old men counsel and young men do. With the retirement this year of Ed Rogers, it appears to me I am the only presently participating member of the March 1950 meeting creating this council. I take it the council wants me to limit my activities to counseling.

My counseling will be generally along the lines of what one of our leading daily papers in North Dakota heads its editorial page, "It Seems to Me."

Following the founder's meeting in March 1950 the governors' conference, composed of the governors of the 48 States, at the request of Governor Youngdahl of Minnesota, passed a resolution creating and assuming direct responsibility for this council. Thus this council has a theoretical standing of some considerable dignity.

At the meeting creating this council, there was thorough discussion on the question of Indian participation. The moving force behind the council, Governor Youngdahl, stated and restated: "The Indians will be brought into future discussions until the problem is licked." This thought was implemented in the creating resolution by stating, "This council shall consist of two persons appointed by the governor of each State, one of whom shall be an Indian whom the governor shall appoint from a panel of three names submitted by the Indians of the State * * *."

The mandatory provision for the panel system of selecting the Indian delegate results in a moral probability the Indian delegate represents the composite thinking of the Indians of his State—not merely the views of an isolated tribe or an isolated individual. Thus it seems to me an essential element for a livable, workable solution is uniquely present in this council. The other delegate appointed by the governor is authorized as the representative of State government. Each of the two delegates represents the views of sovereign governmental entities. Each has a clearly defined responsibility.

A laudable example of an Indian delegate representing the Indians of his State is the Indian delegate from the State of Oklahoma at the Helena, Mont., meeting of this council vigorously opposing the resolution of the council supporting a transfer of health services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Public Health Service. This same delegate continued opposing this transfer of responsibility before the various committees of Congress. At all points he clarified his position by saying "the Indians of Oklahoma."

When we consider the other representative, it seems to me that since he represents the State government, he must, of necessity, be familiar with the views of the State and county officials and particularly with the views of the appointing governor. He is, in effect, voting for the governor. He is speaking for his State. Thus it seems to me a second essential element for a livable, workable solution is uniquely present in this council.

If this governor's representative is afraid to commit the governor, then we must acknowledge that this governor's representative is actually a governor's observer. There is an important distinction of authority between a governor's representative and a governor's observer. A governor's observer may or may not dignify this council, but he adds little or nothing to affirmative efforts.

The creating resolution states: That the council shall (1) consider the various aspects of the Indian problems; (2) act jointly on items of common interest; (3) exchange information among the States; (4) cooperate with the National Congress, Federal and local governmental agencies, and other organizations that are interested in the American Indians; (5) within a reasonable time and after meeting with Indians and Federal rep-

resentatives, recommend to the governors proposed legislation for submission to Congress; and (6) consider such other matters as the council deems advisable.

The problem confronting us was defined by the creating resolution. This resolution states "Whereas it is obvious that it is necessary that the States coordinate and work together to solve their Indian problems." The proceedings show that Governor Youngdahl stated after the passage of the resolution, as follows: "The majority of the Indians want an opportunity for self-improvement and want to work with the white people in the job of becoming good citizens."

We have been selected as, so to speak, the architects to provide the blueprints of recommendations to our governors for proposed legislation for submission to Congress. True, we have discretion, but we cannot ignore our responsibility to actually draw the sadly needed blueprints. The foundation we blueprint for this house if it is to be livable and endure and solve the present problems must recognize and include the legitimate rights and interests of both the Indian tribes and the States. Ignoring the legitimate interests of either will make our time spent here strictly social. Four hundred thousand Indian people, several thousand BIA employees, and 17 State governments will be affected by our work or nonwork, our agreement or disagreement, as the case may be.

Do we, the representatives, want to perform the labor necessary to create these blueprints, or do we, the representatives, merely have a case of that lovely infectious disease called Oklahoma travelitis? Perhaps we can all agree we want the prestige of the Governor's appointment, but like a Congressman coming up for election, we will, at all costs, avoid endorsing anything except the multiplication tables and the Ten Commandments.

It seems to me the Governors' Interstate Indian Council is not convened for the purpose of creating a selective captive audience for government, State, tribal, or special interest politicians reiterating past policies, defending inconsequential criticism or singing the song of We'll Have Pie in the Sky By and By.

Our order for blueprint specifies "cooperate with the National Congress, Federal and local governmental agencies and other organizations that are interested in the American Indian." We will cooperate, but we must not be dominated. We should, at all costs, avoid being known as another resolution-endorsing agency. The influence of a resolution is limited by the resoluteness of the resolving body. We must exercise our delegated authority and fulfill our designated responsibility. Our governors want blueprints, not resolutions.

It seems to me we should not be afraid to examine old ideas or explore new theories. We must be ever mindful that no organization, Government bureau, or political party is the sole custodian of knowledge, scientific fact, and administrative insight in the field of Indian affairs. And we, the representatives of the governors, cannot declare a monopoly on being the friend of the Indian. It seems to me that in respect to the Indian people and the States we represent, we must view with alarm any attempts to stamper us in any direction or on any resolution without a full, free, and complete flow of information and discussion, unhampered by the necessity of attending social events or that age-old convention cry of "I've got to go home because I'm out of money." We cannot, however, view with alarm to the point where we do nothing except recall the trail of tears and the other 1,017 injustices of yesterday. We live with the problems of today. We plan the solutions of tomorrow. Our powwow dance will be to the tune of Accentuate the Positive, Eliminate the Negative.

It seems to me the representatives of the sovereign States and the sovereign Indian tribes rate the cooperation and counseling of the Government's dead horse. Our discussions must be with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, not with his assistant or his public-relations counsel. I am reminded of pleasant Sun Valley where we listened attentively to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reiterate the Bureau's policy. I am again reminded of Sheridan, Wyo., where we, the governor's representatives, paid the Commissioner the respect of attentively listening to him again reiterate the Bureau's policy. However, when it came time for consultation and questions, the Commissioner had a more important prior appointment. Our questions were discussed and largely unanswered by the Commissioner's personable assistants. As an audience, we listened to the lead horse; as governor's representatives attempting to cooperate we heard the second string defending team receive the Bureau's page-worn Book of Answers. Essentially the same book of answers that brought this council into being. Perhaps as realists, we should refill the teacup and do something worthwhile, like speculating on the future of Indian affairs by observing the tea leaves.

It seems to me that under the creating resolution, part 3, "exchange information among the States," we have preliminary blueprints for important panel discussions such as is on our present agenda. Our time is limited, but the necessity of full, free discussion and debate knows no time limitation if the decisions or compromises we reach are to be fully understood and retain influential value for the morrow. A panel discussion, Indian time if you please, can make decisions.

It seems to me that this council must deal with principles, items of community, State or national importance. Separating the significant from the insignificant is admittedly a difficult task. History records only the significant. Do we the governor's representatives have the capacity to pick out from the strawpile of talk the principles? My answer is yes, because so many people and so many States demand that we do something. When we permit our antagonists to lead us into inconsequential arguments, we are asking for defeat. If we stick and insist that the discussion be on ideas and principles, the inconsequential chitter-chat will solve itself.

I am reminded of a conversation I had with one of the prominent delegates after the Carson City meeting. This delegate stated approximately as follows: "Well, the Governor lets me do just about what I want to at this council meeting. When I get back, I usually visit with him for a few moments and tell him of the resolutions that we got through which were of interest to our State, but he really doesn't pay too much attention to this council." I reiterate this indictment because historically it is pretty much true. We, the delegates, have ourselves to thank for this criticism. The time of decision may be closer than we think. I submit that in conformity with our order for blueprints given us by the governors' conference, we should at this ninth annual council have had sufficient exposure to the BIA's historic position to take definite stands on the following important principals.

1. Is the ultimate objective in the field of Indian affairs the social and economic integration of the Indian people with the general citizenry?

2. If integration is the ultimate answer, what, if any, special Federal relationships should be retained by the individual Indians or by the tribes?

3. Again, if integration is the ultimate answer, what blueprint of desegregating community services for Indian people can and will be acceptable to both the Indian people and the States?

4. Should the Federal Government's financial responsibility for community services such as schools, medical care and welfare during the period of transition be related to the needs of land or should it be related to people?

In our discussions, we must be constantly striving for a uniform, mutually agreeable clarification acceptable to both the States and the Indian people of the basic principle of financial responsibility. In making this decision, we must decide which is the more important—land or people?

Until this council comes to grip with the realities of this problem, we will continue to splash water without materially raising the social or economic level of our Indian people. We have the authority. We have the command of the governors of the 48 States to unearth the mutually acceptable solution which has so long evaded the search of our forefathers. Let us work today without shifting this one problem to our children. Our children will need to use all possible energy to solve the big problem now unfolding in this, the infancy of the satellite age.

HISTORY AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE COUNCIL

(By A. H. Wright, Oregon)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, from the great State of Oregon I bring you greetings from our Governor, Robert D. Holmes. Due to the urgency of State affairs, the Governor was not able to attend this meeting, but he sends his regards and best wishes for a successful meeting.

Governor Holmes is vitally interested in the welfare of our Indian people; for the State of Oregon probably faces the biggest, immediate Indian problem in the Nation today, due to the fact that our Klamath people are in the process of being released from Federal supervision. The Governor has set up definite policies concerning the State's relationship with the Indians and the Federal Government, and has instructed me to follow these in our deliberations here at this conference.

The policies of the State of Oregon may be defined as follows:

1. No Federal legislation which vitally affects our Oregon Indians should be enacted without giving the State, the Indian, and the local governmental agencies an opportunity to make a careful, analytical survey of the problems involved and the planning that must be made at the State level to implement the changes that would be brought about by this legislation.

2. All agencies of both the State and Federal Government at every level should unite in an effort to raise the social, educational, and economic standards of our Indian people.

3. All agencies of both the State and Federal Government should make a distinct effort to provide job opportunities for qualified Indian people.

4. All State and local agencies should use every means at their command to provide services for Indian people on the same basis they are provided for non-Indians.

5. Every effort should be made to do away with discriminatory practices.

6. Full citizenship rights should be given our Indian people as soon as feasible and possible, and they should be expected to accept the responsibilities and duties of full citizenship.

7. Within the framework of these policies, the State of Oregon should cooperate with the Federal Government and other States.

I have been requested to outline for this conference the history and accomplishments of the Governors' Interstate Indian Council. The Governors' Interstate Indian Council was organized in 1947. Governor Luther Youngdahl of the State of Minnesota was a bit disturbed with what he considered some of

the arbitrary and unilateral practices of the Indian Bureau in dealing with the Indians in his State, and in an effort to get the State government into the picture, he requested the governors of the various States having a substantial Indian population, to meet in St. Paul and discuss the so-called Indian problem. Governor Youngdahl was of the opinion that the Indians were citizens of the various States as well as being wards of the Federal Government. Therefore, he concluded that the States had an interest in what happened to their Indian citizens. He stated that the Federal Government should at least confer with the States before it took some arbitrary action that would affect not only the Indian people, but the State and certain local governmental agencies as well. There were several governors at this meeting, and, where the governors could not attend, they appointed someone to represent them. It was the consensus at this first meeting that the States did have a vital interest in their Indian people, and that a permanent organization should be established to be called the Governors' Interstate Indian Council. While no charter, constitution, or by-laws was drawn up to govern the activities of the organization, nevertheless, certain guiding principles were set forth at this meeting.

EASTERN WILLIAMS SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Howard Lund, chairman, Eastern Williams Soil Conservation District, and Mr. Morris Stromme, chairman of the Little Muddy Soil Conservation District, telling me of action taken by the district supervisors concerning Senate bill 2496.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAMS COUNTY

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,

Williston, N. Dak., December 17, 1957.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: At our December meeting of the supervisors of the Little Muddy and Eastern Williams Soil Conservation Districts we reviewed and discussed Senate bill 2496. We understand that this bill will be considered at the next session of Congress.

In reviewing this bill we were particularly concerned with part of section 2. Quote, "Whenever the waters of any stream or other body of water are proposed or authorized to be impounded, diverted, the channel deepened, or the stream or other body of water otherwise controlled or modified for any purpose whatever, including navigation and drainage, by any department or agency of the United States, or by any public or private agency under Federal permit or with Federal financial or technical assistance, such department or agency first shall consult with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, etc."

As you know the cooperators in our soil conservation districts receive technical assistance from the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service. Also many of the cooperators receive financial assistance from the United States Department of Agriculture Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Program when applying soil and water conservation practices. Thus, if our interpretation of proposed Senate bill 2496 is correct, much of the conservation work done by cooperators on their farms would first have to be approved by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

Our soil conservation district is pleased to cooperate with the Wildlife Service. However, if Senate bill 2496 as now written should become law, we think it would become more difficult for farmers to apply soil and water conservation practices on their farms. Thus we would actually make less progress in conservation of soil, water, and wildlife than we are making at the present time.

At our December meeting the supervisors of the Little Muddy and Eastern Williams Soil Conservation Districts went on record as opposing Senate bill 2496 as now written.

Kindly give our action your usual thorough consideration when considering Senate 2496.

Sincerely,

HOWARD LUND,
Chairman, Eastern Williams Soil
Conservation District.

MORRIS STROMME,
Chairman, Little Muddy Soil Con-
servation District.

NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS— RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Fred G. Ehlers, president of the State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, enclosing two resolutions adopted at the annual meeting concerning agricultural conservation program practices and soil and water research.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
Hettinger, N. Dak., December 26, 1957.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
The United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Enclosed please find two resolutions passed by the North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts while in session at their 19th annual meeting at Grand Forks, N. Dak., on November 15, 1957.

These two resolutions are:

1. Resolution on agricultural conservation program practices.

2. Proposed research resolution for soil and water research for North Dakota.

Our membership desired that you be informed of our attitude on these two subjects concerning agriculture.

In addition, may I take this opportunity to thank you for your previous support to us in conserving the soil and water resources of North Dakota and the Nation.

Very truly yours,

FRED G. EHLERS,
President.

RESOLUTION ON AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION
PROGRAM PRACTICES—RESOLUTION BY NORTH
DAKOTA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION
DISTRICTS AT THEIR 19TH ANNUAL MEETING
AT GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., NOVEMBER 15,
1957

We wish to commend the Agricultural Conservation Program Service for the assistance and impetus this Service has given to the establishment of conservation practices on farm and ranch lands in this State and in the Nation. This program has done much to further the goals of soil conservation districts.

While the entire program has been of much benefit to farmers and ranchers of this country there is a definite need to strengthen that part of the program dealing with permanent type practices. Benefits and financial returns are not immediate for these

practices; nor always recognizable by the farmers or ranchers. Because of this there is a definite need for financial assistance to get permanent practices applied to our farm and ranch lands. We recommend that the Agricultural Conservation Program Service of the Department of Agriculture do everything possible to strength that portion of the program dealing with permanent enduring type conservation practices. Such strengthening might take the form of increased payments for the permanent practices or in some cases a reduction in emphasis and payment on the so-called annual practices if the annual practices appear to be too competitive.

The conservation reserve program offers many opportunities to landowners to achieve long time conservation benefits. We wish to recommend that the conservation reserve program of the Soil Bank Act be continued.

PROPOSED RESEARCH RESOLUTION FOR SOIL AND
WATER RESEARCH FOR NORTH DAKOTA—RES-
OLUTION BY NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION OF
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS AT THEIR
19TH ANNUAL MEETING AT GRAND FORKS,
N. DAK., NOVEMBER 15, 1957

Whereas grasslands and the livestock economy associated therewith represents a large portion of North Dakota agricultural land, and the conservation and efficient use of water, control of periodic runoff, and associated soil erosion poses a serious threat to these valuable resources on such lands, research in the vital area of conserving and efficiently utilizing limited rainfall on grasslands and protecting the soil resources on such lands needs continued attention. A permanent and stable livestock economy in this area requires establishment and maintenance of a strong research effort on these problems; and

Whereas a large percentage of precipitation received is lost by evaporation and surface runoff under the present practice of using summer fallow in the rotation. (Areas of the State having the least rainfall are using the most summer fallow resulting in a large water loss where water is most needed. Of course the 25 percent of annual rainfall stored in the soil for the use of next year's crop is also of the most value in the areas of lowest annual rainfall.) Soil losses due to wind and water erosion are proportionally very much higher during the summer fallow season than when the field is being cropped. Development of procedures to reduce these losses and improve the efficiency of water use by crops are essential for more effective use of limited rainfall supply. Possibilities of land surface treatment, management systems to reduce runoff, and chemical or other soil treatments to reduce evaporation and runoff losses on summer fallow need to be explored; and

Whereas soil and water problems in the State of North Dakota present a threat to sustained production of livestock and crop products, productivity in the lands of North Dakota have been good for the time they have been farmed. This has made it easy to overlook their decline to date. It is of the utmost importance that the research program be strengthened in line with the agricultural and productive capacity of this region. In this State, farm and ranch families have a continuous struggle to protect their cultivated and grazing land against erosion during high winds, frequent occurrences of excess runoff during winter and spring periods, adjustments of cropping systems to soil and water conserving practices which will insure adequate erosion protection; and

Whereas over a million acres of land are being considered for irrigation in North Dakota, the farmers in these potentially irrigable areas will need to know the expected economic benefits as well as the problems

they will encounter in changing from dryland to irrigative farming: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts hereby directs its officers to request adequate funds from the United States Department of Agriculture and the State of North Dakota to conduct a long-time basic research program commensurate with our needs and increase our present facilities to adequately assist farmers and ranchers in meeting the soil and water problems peculiar to the State of North Dakota. We also direct our officers to carry this resolution to the National Research Committee of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, and that they request the research committee to include such moneys as are needed to expand our research program in the national request for funds from the Congress; be it further

Resolved, That we hereby direct our officers to send copies of this resolution to our Congressional delegation, Secretary of Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget so that they may know of our needs.

STANDING ROCK SIOUX TRIBAL COUNCIL—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a resolution by the Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council urging Congress to enact S. 809, introduced by me and cosponsored by 20 Senators. S. 809 is a bill to provide loans to Indian tribes to encourage industry near Indian reservations for the purpose of aiding the economy of that area and the providing of gainful employment to the American Indian so that he may properly support his family.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE STANDING ROCK SIOUX
TRIBE OF NORTH DAKOTA AND SOUTH DAKOTA
URGING PASSAGE OF S. 809, A BILL TO PRO-
VIDE A FOUR-POINT PROGRAM FOR AMERICAN
INDIANS

Whereas the American Indian community in the midst of the greatest and wealthiest Nation in the world by and large has a standard of living far below the average for this country particularly in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Montana; and

Whereas the Government of the United States in its moral concern over the welfare of peoples in Europe, Asia, and Africa has spent and is spending billions of dollars in an effort to better the living conditions and economy of those foreign peoples; and

Whereas money and technical aid are gravely needed at home for the American Indian: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress enact S. 809 in order that the point 4 program may be brought to the American Indian as well as to foreign nations.

INDIANS HAVE GOOD IDEAS, TOO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Indians Have Good Ideas, Too," published in the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Herald of February 25, 1958. I believe this fine editorial will be most enlightening to the Members of the Congress in trying to solve the very complex problem of Indian affairs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANS HAVE GOOD IDEAS, TOO

In all the discussion of the Indian problem, which comes particularly close to towns like Devils Lake, no one has ever bothered to ask the Indians themselves what they would do to advance their own welfare.

Spokesmen for the Indian people have ideas but they have been too often ignored by the Government in its relations with them. Sometimes we forget that Indian leaders are well qualified to speak for their own people. If the rest of America listened to them, they could learn a lot.

Those leaders are well qualified by education and experience to voice the plight of their brothers. Some work in the professions. All have dedicated themselves to the welfare of their people.

Many Indians would write off the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a failure. Like most Government agencies, it has to unravel itself from a lot of red tape before it can take action on Indian problems, with the result that often not much gets done.

Among those of that belief is William J. Bordeaux of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., who left the reservation 26 years ago. He remembers the turn of the century when Indians had cattle, little supervision and freedom to use their own money. The Sioux began their decline, he says, when the Indian Bureau began selling off the cattle and making the Indian use purchase orders in place of money.

Local judges, he believes, should rule on the competence of individual Indians. Those who are competent should manage their own property free of control. They would pay taxes, in lieu of which States should provide housing in fringe areas of metropolitan centers near reservations.

Other Indians disagree with the idea of writing off the Indian Bureau, for that would make it easier for the Government to wipe its hands of the problem.

Indians and leaders from four States gathered at Rapid City, S. Dak., in early December for a discussion of their needs. They, too, came up with some advice.

They want the Bureau to extend social services to Indians in off-reservation communities.

City governments were asked to create local housing authorities to receive Federal aid from the Federal Public Housing and Redevelopment Administration.

Indigent Indian people also need the services of a legal aid society, which in some cities has been of great help to those in need.

Indians also need psychiatric and social services on the reservations to help them adjust to the complexities of modern life. Tribal councils were urged to consider employing experts on legal aid and psychiatric social services for their members.

Congress already has tried to help the Indians by training them in vocations under a law which went into effect last year. They also have been assisted under relocation programs, if they want it.

These are other attempts at solving a very complex problem, one which challenges our very best minds, both Indian and non-Indian, for a solution.

DEBTORS OF PEERLESS FINANCE CO., FARGO, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article from the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., entitled "Debtors of Fargo Finance Firm Freed From Repayment by Cass Court Order," which was issued after a final

report from the court appointive receiver, when a temporary injunction was imposed against the firm's operations in legal action instituted by the North Dakota attorney general's office.

Mr. President, I have publicly commended the attorney general, the Honorable Leslie Burgum, and his staff for instituting this action against the small-loans sharks which I hope will be completely smashed by these legal actions by the attorney general.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBTORS OF FARGO FINANCE FIRM FREED FROM REPAYMENT BY CASS COURT ORDER

A Cass district court order Monday absolved 394 debtors of the Peerless Finance Co. of Fargo from any liability whatsoever for loans received from the company totaling \$17,230 in face value.

The order was issued by Judge John C. Pollock after he heard a final report from M. A. Wilk, of Fargo, appointed receiver for the firm in December 1956. Wilk was appointed when a temporary injunction was imposed against the firm's operations in legal action instituted by the North Dakota attorney general's office.

Wilk, represented by Attorney Mart Vogel, of Fargo, recommended the court order in view of the civil liability imposed under North Dakota laws against those proven to have charged usurious rates of interest.

He told the court these same laws had prevented him from making any attempt to collect on any of the loans placed in his custody as a receiver of the firm.

Wilk contended that if he had tried to collect, the borrowers could have filed lawsuits against the firm and possibly collected amounts far in excess of what he could have realized for the firm on the notes.

He said the situation existed because so many of the outstanding loans the firms had made were to borrowers who had borrowed several times from the firm and had made some repayments of loans that included usurious interest charges.

All but 17 of the 394 debtors involved were "repeat" borrowers, Wilk said.

Wilk cited one example of a party that had borrowed 30 times from the firm since June 1948.

On a current \$100 note, he said the borrower owed the company \$48.80 in interest, or \$46.75 in excess of the 7 percent annual maximum rate legally allowed now in North Dakota.

Deducting for the excess interest and 25 percent of the principal, which the debtor could do under the law because he had been charged usurious interest, would leave \$77.05 that the company could collect.

This same borrower, however, had previously borrowed and paid back another \$100 loan and interest of \$48.80.

State law would allow him to sue the firm for twice the amount of the excess interest charged plus 25 percent of the principal, or \$118.50 for the note and interest he had paid.

Thus, Wilk explained, any attempt to enforce the collection of the \$77.05 that could be collected legally on the outstanding note would subject the company to possible legal action for \$118.50.

This same situation exists for the bulk of the loans the firm has out, Wilk said.

A temporary injunction imposed against the firm in December 1956 was made permanent last January after attorneys for Dale L. Hooker, Omaha, Nebr., operator of the firm, signed a stipulation agreeing to end their opposition to the injunction action.

The firm has been closed and in custody of a court-appointed receiver since December 5, 1956, when the injunction action was

brought by the North Dakota attorney general's office on the grounds the firm was charging usurious rates of interest.

Seven percent annually is the maximum legal rate of interest on borrowed money under North Dakota law.

In its complaint against the Peerless firm, the State alleged the company had charged as high as 277 percent interest on small loans.

Francis Murphy, Fargo attorney representing Hooker, was present at Monday's hearing before Judge Pollock and raised no objection to the court's ruling.

Asked about the possibility of an appeal from the order, Murphy told a reporter the hearing was the final step in the case so far as he was concerned.

Donald Crothers, of southwest Fargo, defense attorney with Murphy in the case, could not be reached.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter and a resolution I have received from the United Mine Workers of America.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,

Washington, D. C., March 13, 1958.

To the Members of the United States Senate, 85th Congress.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the international executive board of the United Mine Workers of America, I submit to you the enclosed resolution unanimously adopted by the board in executive session, Washington, D. C., March 12, 1958.

The resolution is self-explanatory and is designed to give the most direct and immediate succor to the unemployed peoples of this Nation.

It is our hope that you will give your personal attention and efforts in the enactment of legislation to activate the purpose of this resolution.

Yours very truly,

JOHN OWENS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Whereas the United Mine Workers of America for a number of years have been advocating an increase in the schedules for unemployment compensation payments, and for the payments to continue for the duration of the unemployment period; and

Whereas we believe that this is the most direct approach in caring for the unemployed in the Nation; and

Whereas we further believe that these payments should be made by the Federal Government to the various States in behalf of the unemployed because to do otherwise would require concurrent legislation in the various States in many of which the general assemblies will not meet for some time; Therefore, be it

Resolved by the international executive board of the United Mine Workers of America, now in session in Washington, D. C., That we recommend to the Congress of the United States the immediate adoption of legislation upon the following basis: First, that the unemployment compensation payments be based on 75 percent of the average weekly wage of the beneficiary. Second, that the payments be made direct to the States on behalf of the unemployed beneficiaries, and that this amount be the difference between that paid by the State and the amount provided in new Federal legislation, as the basis for computing costs of the Federal Government. Third, that the new unemployment benefits be paid for the duration of the unemployment period.

FOREST ACCESS ROADS—RESOLUTION OF GRANGEVILLE, IDAHO, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a resolution of the Grangeville, Idaho, Chamber of Commerce, asking for increased appropriations for forest access roads.

Mr. President, the amount appropriated in fiscal 1958, and approved by the House of Representatives for fiscal 1959, for forest access roads is \$5,914,000 less than the amount authorized. If this money were appropriated, it could be put to work now to achieve not only needed road construction, but also to help solve the unemployment problem.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas over 80 percent of Idaho County, Idaho (4,414,191 acres), is national forest land; and

Whereas only about one-half of the allowable annual cut of timber is being harvested each year from this Federal land; and

Whereas increasing sales of national forest timber to the allowable cut that can be continued in perpetuity would provide needed jobs and local revenue for schools and roads; and

Whereas the greatest obstacle to increasing the annual timber harvest is the absence of an adequate road system; and

Whereas the construction of forest access roads by the Federal Government makes it possible for the Forest Service to offer smaller blocks of timber for sale and thereby make it possible for small operators to bid competitively for timber; and

Whereas the preponderance of timber operators in this area are small operators who are dependent upon the national forests as a source of timber; and

Whereas construction of needed access roads will also enable hunters, fishermen, picnickers, campers and other recreationists to visit additional forest areas; and

Whereas every dollar used on construction of needed forest access roads returns more than the principal to the United States Treasury within 1 to 4 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Grangeville Chamber of Commerce, Grangeville, Idaho, does hereby recommend and urge the Congress of the United States to:

1. Immediately and substantially increase appropriations to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture for access roads; and
2. Continue such appropriations until the road systems on the National Forests are adequate to provide management of all resources upon the sound principles of multiple use and sustained yield; and
3. That copies of the resolution be sent to all Senators and Representatives from Idaho in the United States Congress

NATIONAL CAPITAL CULTURAL CENTER OF THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have introduced in the Senate, and Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, has introduced in the House companion bills, S. 3335 and H. R. 9848, authorizing construction of a privately financed National Capital Cultural Center of the Performing Arts, to be located on a federally owned site on the Mall, opposite the National Gallery of Art.

It is my understanding that the Senate Public Works Committee will hold hearings on this proposal in the near future.

In the Washington Post of Sunday, March 16, there appeared an excellent article entitled "Mall Is Fit Spot for Hall," written by the distinguished columnist and drama critic, Richard L. Coe.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine article, commenting on the merits of this proposal, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALL IS FIT SPOT FOR HALL

(By Richard L. Coe)

How about that auditorium?

New Jersey's dogged Democrat Congressman FRANK THOMPSON has been joined in his efforts by the lucid Senator from Arkansas, WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, in trying to latch onto Mall property opposite the National Gallery of Art for a National Cultural Center of the Performing Arts.

What could be a more fitting spot?

In the way and very much in the way is a concurrent attempt to latch onto the same land for an air museum. It doesn't take much imagination to see that a worthwhile air museum would soon be busting at the seams in such comparatively restricted space. Representative THOMPSON points out that Bolling Air Force Base is soon to be evacuated and that it would make an ideal setting for the air exhibits. An auditorium would need space—and parking underneath it—but nothing like the space of a worthy collection of air age mementos would require.

To resolve this impasse hearings will be held shortly before Senator PAT McNAMARA's Subcommittee on Public Buildings. The Michigan Democrat heading this subdivision of the Senate Committee on Public Works plans to give good warning of the hearings since he is aware there is a definite conflict between the auditorium and air interests for the site.

What can Washingtonians who want an auditorium do to let their interests be known about this?

Looks like it's the old answer for this voteless community—letters, wires, public discussion, and whatever pressures can be mustered.

One outfit that's been supremely quiet about supporting an auditorium adjacent to the Mellon Gallery has been the board of trade. Now is the time for its cultural development subcommittee to start cracking.

One reason the Board of Trade may have lost interest was the failure of last year's auditorium commission to gain the Foggy Bottom site it envisioned for a far more ambitious project which would have included a huge convention hall.

Somebody should alert Board members to the fact that a worthy auditorium could well attract visitors to the city just as the Mellon Gallery has done. And someone should also remind the members that the projected annual performing arts festival could have no future at all unless a suitable building is created.

Representative THOMPSON's new bill (H. R. 9848) benefits from his experience last year with the more ambitious project in Foggy Bottom. When that was defeated its opponents said "We can still have the cultural center and quicker, on one of the several available Government-owned sites."

Now he has pinpointed, with eminent logic it seems to me, the land Congress picked out in 1938 for a national art center. That project has been moved to the old Patent Office building (Seventh and F Streets, NW.) but aviation interests have been trying to move in on the Mall property.

THOMPSON says that his bill would provide a cultural center similar in purpose to the \$205 million Lincoln Square Center of the Performing Arts now under way in New York. Once the Government grants the land, Robert Dowling, president of the American National Theater and Academy, foresees financing on nongovernmental level.

The Ford and Rockefeller Foundations contributed \$2½ million each to Gotham's Lincoln Square project and there are indications they also would contribute to a similar venture here. Private individuals and public groups also have promised contributions.

The ultimate set-up would be similar to the Smithsonian Institution, regents of which are directed to solicit gifts, bequests, subscriptions, and moneys to construct, furnish, equip, and maintain. The procedure is the same which set up the Mellon and Freer Art Galleries and is now working on the Bell Tower Memorial to the late Senator Taft.

The need for such an auditorium can hardly be exaggerated. It was glaringly reflected last week when a full-stage production of Back to Methuselah was pushed onto the hopelessly ill-equipped platform of Constitution Hall. It should never have been there, nor should operatic or ballet events, but so long as the platform is the only choice, the managers will be using it, a system under which the public and the artists are the losers.

What chance of success does this Fulbright-Thompson effort have?

With no District of Columbia vote and only a few spokesmen, fruition of the auditorium dream depends on letting the Members of Congress know how both Washingtonians and home State voters feel about the glaring cultural lack in what is supposed to be the capital of the Western World.

THOMPSON pointed out the other day that the real Trojan horse is the declining level of education with its vulgarization of cultural standards. If this is not reversed, and immediately, we shall soon become a big but second-rate people, fat, Philistine, and self-indulgent.

Granting by Congress of the Mall land for a fitting twin to the world-respected Mellon Gallery could clearly be a fruitful achievement. Surely with the space and equipment already at Bolling, the Air Museum already has a potential home. For our own and visiting foreign performing arts the capital of the Western World has none.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Under the unanimous-consent order entered on Friday last, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, commencing with Order No. 1368.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate is proceeding, under a unanimous-consent agreement, with a call of the calendar commencing with Order No. 1368. The clerk will state the first measure which is in order on the calendar.

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND FOR COWPENS NATIONAL BATTLEGROUND SITE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 602) to provide for the acquisition of additional land to be used in connection with the Cowpens National Battlefield site, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "ground, the Secretary is authorized and directed to accept, for use as a parking lot for the convenience of persons visiting the monument heretofore erected on the land heretofore acquired pursuant to such act, any plot of land (not in excess of 5 acres) adjacent to such heretofore acquired land which may be tendered as a gift to the United States for such purpose" and insert "ground, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land not to exceed 1 acre, situated adjacent to and between the present battlefield site and relocated Highway 11", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in addition to the land heretofore acquired by the United States by gift pursuant to the act entitled "An act to erect a national monument at Cowpens battleground," approved March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1558), for the purpose of erecting a monument on the site of the Cowpens battleground, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to accept, on behalf of the United States, donations of land not to exceed 1 acre, situated adjacent to and between the present battlefield site and relocated Highway 11.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the passage today of my bill, S. 602, will afford a great sense of satisfaction to the patriotic groups in South Carolina who have sponsored and urged the enactment of this bill. I may be pardoned a personal reference when I say it will likewise be a source of great personal pleasure to me. Having been born at Honea Path, S. C., and having had my home and office so close by the battleground at Cowpens, I have felt an abiding and continuing interest in a due recognition of the importance of this important engagement in the cause of American freedom.

The enlargement of the grounds surrounding the battle site is in part a fitting tribute to its importance. The historical accounts of the engagements in South Carolina culminating in Green's and Morgan's victory at Cowpens saved the Southern Colonies to the American cause. Many at that time felt that the victories at Kings Mountain and Cowpens would have an adverse effect in the efforts of the patriotic forces in the Southland. It was felt that they might become complacent with victory. To the contrary, these successes had just the opposite effect. They inspired the southern soldiers to a more determined effort. The battles at Camden, S. C., Kings Mountain, Cowpens, and Guilford Courthouse forced Cornwallis and his battered troops to retire to Wilmington, N. C. The net result of these successes of the Continental forces led Cornwallis to take refuge at Yorktown where on October 19, 1781, he finally surrendered.

This surrender was followed by the signing of peace on November 30, 1782.

The Daughters of the American Revolution have urged the enlargement of the grounds surrounding the battlefield as a useful means of protecting and preserving its integrity. The recognition by the Congress in the enactment of S. 602 will be a fitting tribute to the patriotic efforts of these good women. Their relentless efforts to maintain and preserve our historic shrines are appreciated by Americans everywhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMPORTATION OF ARTICLES FOR EXHIBITION PURPOSES WITHOUT PAYMENT OF TARIFF

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 439) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, was considered, order to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LENDING OF CERTAIN ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE EQUIPMENT TO THE GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The bill (S. 2630) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and to permit use of certain lands of the Air Force Academy for use at the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, a corporation created under the act of March 16, 1950, for the use and accommodation of the approximately 10,000 Girl Scouts and officials who are to attend the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment to be held during the period beginning in June 1959 and ending in July 1959, at Colorado Springs, Colo., such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful, to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such encampment, and to be returned at such time after the close of such encampment, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the Girl Scouts of the United States of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition,

and the whole without expense to the United States.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may provide, to permit, without expense to the United States Government, the Girl Scouts of the United States of America to use such portions of the undeveloped lands of the United States Air Force Academy adjacent to such encampment as may be necessary or useful, to the extent that their use will not interfere with the activities of such Academy, and will not jeopardize the national-defense program.

WEARING OF UNIFORM OF RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS BY CERTAIN PERSONS

The bill (H. R. 7696) to authorize certain persons to wear the uniform of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPLACEMENT OF CENTRAL PORTION OF THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2883) to amend the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, to eliminate the requirement that the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the United States Capitol be in substantial accord with scheme B of the architectural plan of March 3, 1905, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, Mr. President. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM

The bill (H. R. 9653) to provide that the Fort Gaines lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River shall hereafter be known and designated as the Walter F. George lock and dam was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the bill will designate the lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River between the States of Georgia and Alabama as the Walter F. George lock and dam.

Every Member of the Senate, of course, knew my distinguished predecessor in the Senate, the late President pro tempore of the Senate, Walter F. George. He had one of the most remarkable political careers in the history of my State. He was dearly beloved by all the people of Georgia.

I believe it is a very fitting tribute to the late distinguished statesman from my State that the Congress of the United States designate the Fort Gaines lock and dam in his honor. Senator George was one of the most beloved men who ever served in the United States Senate.

The best illustration I believe I could use to demonstrate the esteem and affection which his colleagues in this body had for Senator George is that when he passed away a little less than a year ago the Senate, out of respect to his memory, sent at least one-third of its members on a round trip of almost 1,500 miles to pay him honor and tribute.

I did not want to let this opportunity pass, Mr. President, without inviting the attention of Members of the Senate to

the bill, and in this way further showing a mark of respect to the late distinguished and great Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the very fine statement he has made relative to the naming of the lock and dam for the late distinguished Senator from that State, our former President pro tempore, a man who served both as chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

I did not want this opportunity to pass without assuring my friend and colleague from Georgia that the sentiments he has expressed today represent not only the feeling of those on his side of the aisle, but the unanimous feeling of all of us on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION BUILDING TO THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1984) to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Smithsonian Institution to house certain art collections of the Smithsonian Institution, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "essential", to strike out the semicolon and "but in any event such transfer shall be made within 5 years after the date of the enactment of this act"; in line 12, after the word "it", to strike out "entirely"; and in line 13, after the word "Institution", to insert "upon transfer of funds available to the Smithsonian Institution for such purposes"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Administrator of General Services shall transfer the Civil Service Commission Building (formerly known as the Patent Office Building), and the site thereof located between Seventh and Ninth Streets and F and G Streets NW, in the District of Columbia, to the Smithsonian Institution without reimbursement, for the use of certain art galleries of the Smithsonian Institution.

(b) The transfer provided for by subsection (a) shall be made at such time as the Administrator of General Services determines that the use of the building by the Federal Government for office purposes is no longer essential.

(c) The Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Smithsonian Institution, is authorized to enter into such contracts and take such other action as may be necessary to make it suitable to house certain art galleries of the Smithsonian Institution upon transfer of funds available to the Smithsonian Institution for such purposes.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, Mr. President. We do not think this bill is properly calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

ACCEPTANCE OF DECORATIONS BY CERTAIN PERSONNEL CONFERRED BY THE PHILIPPINE GOVERNMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8437) to amend the act of August 3, 1956, to authorize certain personnel of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations conferred by the Philippine Government, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "amended", to insert "(a) by striking out the words 'Armed Forces' and inserting in lieu thereof 'uniformed services' and (b)"; in line 7, after the word "the", where it appears the third time, to strike out "Armed Forces" and insert "uniformed services"; and on page 3, after line 14, to insert:

(9) Following that part of section 1 captioned "Air Force" add a new paragraph as follows:

"COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

"Capt. Charles Pierce, 1030, Legion of Honor, degree of commander."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the act of August 3, 1956, to authorize certain personnel of the uniformed services to accept and wear decorations conferred by the Philippine Government."

WHEAT ACREAGE HISTORY

The bill (S. 3406) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, Mr. President. The bill is not properly calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if it is intended that Calendar No. 1378, S. 3420, a bill to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, popularly known as Public Law 480, and Calendar No. 1380, S. 3406, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938,

as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history, will be taken up for consideration by motion during this week?

Mr. TALMADGE. The majority leader has so announced. This side of the aisle—or at least the calendar committee—is wholeheartedly in favor of those bills, but we believed they were of sufficient importance and of such a major nature as to warrant debate and discussion by the entire membership of the Senate.

The majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], indicated last week that the major agricultural bills would be taken up by and would be voted on by the Senate this week.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, both the bills are of major importance. It would be desirable, I think, to have the membership of the Senate on notice as to a definite time when the bill will be called up for consideration.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 14, page 4483, where the Senator from Texas set forth the legislative program for the week. The Senator stated:

Mr. President, following the call of the calendar, at the earliest practical opportunity, the following measures will be brought before the Senate:

Calendar No. 1378, S. 3420, extending and amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Calendar No. 1392, S. 3441, providing for a minimum-acreage allotment for corn and other purposes.

Calendar No. 1393, S. 3408, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide that cotton-acreage allotments for the States for 1958 and subsequent years shall be no less than in 1956.

Calendar No. 1394, S. 3385, amending section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn-acreage allotments.

And so forth. The list includes, in addition to the bills I have mentioned, at least six other bills, most of which deal with major agricultural products.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise that Calendar No. 1416, House bill 11086, is a companion bill to one of the bills just mentioned. Undoubtedly it will be passed over.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the Senator from Georgia can be a little more precise as to what the most practical moment will be for calling up these bills, and whether or not they will be called up in the order enumerated by the statement of the majority leader, which the Senator from Georgia has just read.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have no way of knowing what the majority leader had in mind, except what he said. I would not attempt to interpret the meaning of what he said. I think the statement is clear. I think it indicates that the majority leader expects to bring the bills up at the earliest possible opportunity this week.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I note that the distinguished majority leader is now present in the Chamber. I wonder if it would be possible for him to

give us any sharper definition as to the time when these agricultural measures may be brought up for consideration. With respect to one or two of them, the Senator from South Dakota was contemplating possibly making a statement, and perhaps offering an amendment. If it were at all possible to be a little more precise as to the time when they will be called up, I think it would be helpful, not only to me, but to other Members of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before the distinguished majority leader answers the question, I should like to have him know that in his absence we conferred with the calendar committees on both sides of the aisle relative to Calendar No. 1394, Senate bill 3385, which relates to the counties which have become commercial corn counties this year for the first time. We find there is no opposition to the bill. In view of the fact that corn planting is in progress in my State at this time, I had hoped that the bill could be passed today, either on the call of the calendar or upon motion later.

I do not believe any of the other agricultural bills are in the same situation. The bill to which I refer was unanimously reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I did not hear the inquiry of my friend from South Dakota. If he will repeat it, I shall try to be responsive.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if it would be possible to fix a little more precisely the time at which the various agricultural bills which have been mentioned may be considered. As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] has indicated, they are of wide interest. There is hardly a State that is not affected by them in some way. If we knew more precisely when they were coming up, we could adjust our schedules and be ready with statements or amendments more promptly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader wishes to retain a reasonable degree of flexibility as to the order in which the various bills are to be called up.

All the bills listed on pages 4483 and 4484 of the RECORD are ready for action, but because of the indication by the Senator from Vermont that there might be some controversy with respect to the measure relating to Public Law 480, I do not plan to call it up on motion today, because certain Senators desire to be absent on St. Patrick's Day. Unless I change my plans—and I do not think I shall—the bill relating to Public Law 480 will not come up today.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is definitely helpful. Is it the prospect that the bill relating to wheat acreage will be taken up today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. I do not plan to move to take up any bills today, other than those which may be passed on the call of the calendar.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is certainly helpful, and I appreciate the statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am always glad to accommodate my friend, to reciprocate for his kindness to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, what can the majority leader tell us with respect to the bill I mentioned a few minutes ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The calendar committees have cleared it. I am always glad to see such bills acted upon promptly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

PETRIFIED FOREST NATIONAL PARK, ARIZ.—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 2359) to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar. House action is pending at this moment, and it is hoped that the Congressional action on the bill can be completed if we place it at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8002) to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over. It is not proper business to be disposed of on the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RICHARD K. LIM AND MARGARET K. LIM

The bill (S. 1987) for the relief of Richard K. Lim and Margaret K. Lim was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Richard K. Lim and Margaret K. Lim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

SAYO ONO TAYLOR

The bill (S. 2735) for the relief of Sayo Ono Taylor was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sayo Ono Taylor shall be held and consid-

ered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ABBAS MOHAMMAD AWAD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2713) for the relief of Abbas Mohammad Awad, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bonds which may have issued in the case of Abbas Mohammad Awad. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Abbas Mohammad Awad shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHANNA DIPPOLD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2807) for the relief of Johanna Dippold, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act Johanna Dippold, the fiancée of Carl R. Pitchford, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Johanna Dippold is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Carl R. Pitchford and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Johanna Dippold, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Johanna Dippold, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Johanna Dippold as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMPACT BETWEEN THE STATE OF OREGON AND THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7153) giving consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Oregon and the State of Washington establishing a boundary between those States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL AUTOMATION CONGRESS AND EXPOSITION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 347) authorizing and requesting the President to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to June 13, 1958, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "authorized", to strike out "and requested"; and in line 7, after the year "1958", to strike out the semicolon and "and be it further

"Resolved, That no funds appropriated by Congress for any purpose whatsoever shall be used to defray the expenses of any foreign country or foreign individual participating in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in New York City".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the several States and foreign countries to take part in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in the New York Coliseum at New York, N. Y., from June 9 to June 13, 1958."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3441) to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over. It is not proper business to be disposed of on the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3408) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide that cotton-

acreage allotments for the States for 1958 and subsequent years shall be no less than in 1956, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Senate bill 3408 is a bill authored by the junior Senator from Georgia and several other Senators. I ask unanimous consent at this time that the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] be listed as one of the sponsors of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. The bill is extremely important to a vast section of our country, but it is the opinion of the calendar committee that it is not calendar business, and it is requested that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CORN-ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3385) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn-acreage allotments, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "under", to insert "an acreage-reserve contract or", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 114 of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no person shall be ineligible to receive payments or compensation under an acreage-reserve contract or a conservation-reserve contract by reason of the fact that the corn acreage on the farm exceeds the farm-acreage allotment for corn if such contract was entered into prior to January 1 of the first year for which the county is included in the commercial corn-producing area: *Provided*, That the foregoing provisions of this sentence shall apply only to a farm for which an 'old farm' corn allotment is established for such first year. For purposes of this provision, a contract which has been terminated by the producer under the program regulations by reason of the fact that the county in which the farm is located was included in the commercial corn-producing area for the first time in 1958, and which is reinstated, shall be deemed to have been entered into as of the original date of execution of such contract."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the calendar committees on both sides of the aisle, and of the majority and minority leaders in permitting passage of the bill at this time.

The bill provides that farmers in counties which become commercial corn counties for the first time—and there are 38 such counties in the Nation this year—who are regular corn planters, and who enter into conservation reserve or acreage reserve contracts prior to January 1 of the first year in which the county is included in the commercial corn area, shall be exempted from the requirement of cross-compliance with corn acreage allotments.

The House has passed a similar bill. There are minor differences between the two bills, and the Department of Agriculture is willing to recommend approval of the language of the Senate bill.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of the House bill, H. R. 10843, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill, that all after the enacting clause be stricken, and that the text of the Senate bill be inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the bill referred to is not at the desk at the present time. The bill will be sent for.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was advised by the staff of the committee that it was ready to be acted upon.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the situation, the Senator from Florida is asking that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of the House bill. Would that not bring it automatically before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first inquiry the Senator has directed to the Chair is correct. However, the Chair is endeavoring to get the bill to the desk. Once that has been accomplished, further action can be taken on the matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that when the bill reaches the desk the Senator from Florida be allowed to take up the item again for the action already indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1394, S. 3385. H. R. 10843, a companion bill, was before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but by earlier action the Senate discharged the committee from further consideration of the House bill, and I desire it substituted for the Senate bill and considered at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask the nature of the bill to which the Senator from Florida is referring?

Mr. HOLLAND. The bill, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, relates to the counties which have become commercial corn counties this year for the first time, and in which corn growers have found themselves in the very difficult position of being adversely affected by penalties not within the mind of either the Government or themselves at the time the corn growers entered into earlier contracts with the Government for acreage reserve or conservation reserve under the Soil Bank. It also applies to future situations of this kind.

Mr. AIKEN. I realize that those growers are deserving of having something done for them, but I was wondering about Calendar No. 1392, S. 3441, to pro-

vide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn and other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill was passed over on the call of the calendar.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to inquire about it. That is the bill in which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is very much interested. It seems to me that it should be tied in with the bill which the Senator from Florida is seeking to have considered now, because it fixes allotments for corn. It also was reported unanimously by the committee. Was there objection to Calendar No. 1392, S. 3441?

Mr. CLARK. There was objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say, for the information of the Senator from Vermont, that both calendar committees agreed to the consideration of the bill which I have just called up. The majority leader has announced that the other agricultural bills, five in number, will be brought up at the earliest practical opportunity.

Mr. ELLENDER. I objected to the consideration of Calendar No. 1392, S. 3441, on the assumption that it would be taken up tomorrow or at the earliest practical opportunity. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] desired to be present when it was taken up. That is why I objected.

Mr. AIKEN. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. I am agreeable to having it go over until tomorrow. I simply thought that if we gave consideration to one of the bills, we ought to give consideration to the other, too. But on the assurance that it will be taken up shortly, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 10843?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10843) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be amended by striking out everything after the enacting clause and substituting, in lieu thereof, the text of the Senate bill, S. 3385, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 10843) was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 3385 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill is indefinitely postponed.

FISHERIES LOAN FUND

The bill (S. 3295) to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to increase the authorization for the fisheries loan fund established under such act was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CLARK. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ATTENDANCE BY CERTAIN FOREIGN STUDENTS AT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3243) to permit certain foreign students to attend the District of Columbia Teachers College on the same basis as a resident of the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, in line 5, after the word "visas", to strike out "shall" and insert "may", and in line 9, after the word "Columbia", to insert "Admission to and attendance at such college by such students shall be subject to rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed 25 foreign students who are in the United States on valid unexpired student visas may be permitted to attend the District of Columbia Teachers College each year on the same basis, so far as payment of tuition and fees are concerned, as a resident of the District of Columbia. Admission to and attendance at such college by such students shall be subject to rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the bill arises by reason of the fact that approximately 25 students from perhaps a dozen foreign countries were admitted to the District of Columbia Teachers College this fall without the payment of tuition and with the understanding that they would not be required to pay tuition. Their personal finances and the public assistance available to them from their countries were based on that understanding. After the conclusion of the first semester the local authorities advising the District of Columbia Teachers College discovered some legal objection in the law to permitting these foreign students to attend the Teachers College without payment of fees.

There was quite an uproar in the newspapers about the situation, to the effect that these young men and women had been unfairly dealt with in being brought to this country under an understanding and then being told that a fee would have to be paid, which fee they were unable to pay. Under the circumstances, as a member of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I undertook to introduce proposed remedial legislation which would permit the students to stay in the country in accordance with the initial understanding. The bill was approved by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia and by the three Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and it was also unanimously approved by the Committee on the District of Columbia. It was also approved by the Department of State, which indicated it was quite relieved that the bill had been introduced, as the situation was causing the Department some embarrassment.

Mr. ELLENDER. The necessity for the bill is that under the present laws the Board of Education of the District of Columbia is precluded from giving free tuition to foreign students. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. They did not know it at the time they accepted the students.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNIFORM SIMULTANEOUS DEATH ACT

The bill (H. R. 3486) to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply in the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECREATION BOARD FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1843) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes," approved April 29, 1942, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following paragraph be added at the end of section 2, article II, of the act entitled "An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes," approved April 29, 1942:

"Notwithstanding the provision of section 301 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended (68 Stat. 1110; 5 U. S. C. 921), requiring regularity in the scheduled work between the hours of 6 o'clock postmeridian and 6 o'clock antemeridian, the Board shall have the power to prescribe rules and regulations governing the payment of night differential for nonregularly scheduled work between such hours by such of its employees as are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, when such nonregularly scheduled work is within the employee's basic workweek: *Provided, however,* That all other provisions of such section 301 shall be in full force and effect: *Provided further,* That no night differential may be paid for night overtime work that is not regularly scheduled."

REMOVAL OF DANGEROUS AND UNSAFE BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3059) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "by", to strike out "(a)"; in line 9, after the word "thereof", to strike out "Commissioners", and (b) conform to the term "Commissioners" the pronouns

modifying 'inspector of buildings' wherever such pronouns occur in such act" and insert "'Commissioners'. The first sentence of the first section of such act, as amended, is amended by striking 'his opinion' and inserting in lieu thereof 'their opinion' and by striking 'he shall' and inserting in lieu thereof 'they shall'"; and on page 3, line 15, after the word "first", to strike out "four" and insert "three"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1899 (30 Stat. 923, as amended; title 5, ch. 5, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking the term "inspector of buildings" wherever such term appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "Commissioners." The first sentence of the first section of such act, as amended, is amended by striking "his opinion" and inserting in lieu thereof "their opinion" and by striking "he shall" and inserting in lieu thereof "they shall."

SEC. 2. The first section of such act, as amended (sec. 5-501, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The term 'Commissioners' means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia sitting as a board or the agent or agents designated by them to perform any function vested in said Commissioners by this act."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of such act, as amended (sec. 5-503, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking the third sentence therefrom.

SEC. 4. The second sentence of section 4 of such act, as amended (sec. 5-504, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking "bear interest at the rate of 10 percent per annum until paid, and be carried on the regular tax rolls of the District of Columbia and shall be collected in the manner provided for the collection of general taxes" and inserting in lieu thereof "be collected as general taxes are collected in said District in the manner provided in section 6 of this act."

SEC. 5. Such act, as amended, is amended by inserting the following sections immediately after section 4, reading as follows:

"Sec. 5. The Commissioners shall determine the cost and expense of any work performed by them under the authority of the first four sections of this act and shall assess such cost and expense upon the lot or ground whereon such structure, excavation, or nuisance stands, stood, was dug, was located, or existed, and this amount shall be collected as general taxes are collected in said District in the manner provided in section 6 of this act. Any person, corporation, partnership, syndicate, or company subject to the provisions of the first 3 sections of this act who shall neglect or refuse to perform any act required by such sections shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$50 for each and every day said person, corporation, partnership, syndicate, or company fails to perform any act required by such sections.

"SEC. 6. Any tax authorized to be levied and collected under this act may be paid without interest within 60 days from the date such tax was levied. Interest of one-half of 1 percent for each month or part thereof shall be charged on all unpaid amounts from the expiration of 60 days from the date such tax was levied. Any such tax may be paid in three equal installments with interest thereon. If any such tax or part thereof shall remain unpaid after the expiration of 2 years from the date such tax was levied, the property against which said tax was levied may be sold for such

tax or unpaid portion thereof with interest and penalties thereon at the next ensuing annual tax sale in the same manner and under the same conditions as property sold for delinquent general real-estate taxes, if said tax with interest and penalties thereon shall not have been paid in full prior to said sale."

SEC. 6. Section 5 of such act, as amended (sec. 5-505, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is renumbered "Section 7" and is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Any notice required by this act to be served shall be deemed to have been served when served by any of the following methods: (1) when forwarded to the last known address of the owner as recorded in the real estate assessment records of the District of Columbia, by registered mail, with return receipt, and such receipt shall constitute prima facie evidence of service upon such owner if such receipt is signed either by the owner or by a person of suitable age and discretion located at such address: *Provided*, That valid service upon the owner shall be deemed effected if such notice shall be refused by the owner and not delivered for that reason; or (2) when delivered to the person to be notified; or (3) when left at the usual residence or place of business of the person to be notified with a person of suitable age and discretion then resident or employed therein; or (4) if no such residence or place of business can be found in the District of Columbia by reasonable search, then if left with any person of suitable age and discretion employed at the office of any agent of the person to be notified, which agent has any authority or duty with reference to the land or tenement to which said notice relates; or (5) if any such notice forwarded by registered mail be returned for reasons other than refusal, or if personal service of any such notice, as hereinbefore provided, cannot be effected, then if published on 3 consecutive days in a daily newspaper published in the District of Columbia; or (6) if by reason of an outstanding unrecorded transfer of title the name of the owner in fact cannot be ascertained beyond a reasonable doubt, then if served on the owner of record in a manner hereinbefore provided. Any notice to a corporation shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed to have been served on such corporation if served on the president, secretary, treasurer, general manager, or any principal officer of such corporation in the manner hereinbefore provided for the service of notices on natural persons holding property in their own right; and notices to a foreign corporation shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed to have been served if served personally on any agent of such corporation, or if left with any person of suitable age and discretion residing at the usual residence or employed at the usual place of business of such agent in the District of Columbia.

"(b) In case such notice is served by any method other than personal service, a copy of such notice shall also be sent to the owner by ordinary mail."

SEC. 7. Such act, as amended, is amended by inserting a new section immediately after section 7, as renumbered by this amendatory act, reading as follows:

"SEC. 8. Whenever the Commissioners find that any building or part of a building, staging or other structure, or anything attached to or connected with any building or other structure or excavation shall cause a building to be unsafe for human occupancy, they shall give notice of such fact to the owner or other person having an interest in such building, and to the occupant or occupants thereof. If within 5 days after such notice has been served upon such owner or other interested person, such building or part thereof has not been made safe for human

occupancy, the Commissioners may order the use of such building or part thereof discontinued until it has been made safe: *Provided*, That if in the opinion of the Commissioners the unsafe condition of the building or part thereof is such as to be imminently dangerous to the life or limb of any occupant, the Commissioners may order the immediate discontinuance of the use of such building or part thereof. Any person occupying, or permitting the occupancy of, such building or part thereof in violation of such order of the Commissioners shall be fined not more than \$300 or imprisoned for not more than 30 days."

SEC. 8. Section 6 of such act, as amended, is renumbered "section 9."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION FREE OF DUTY OF ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR EXHIBITION PURPOSES

The bill (H. R. 10242) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Chicago International Fair and Exposition to be held in July 1959, at Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARIFICATION OF NAVIGATION RULES FOR THE GREAT LAKES

The bill (S. 1976) to clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of February 8, 1895, entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters" (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 645; 33 U. S. C. 241), is amended by deleting the first sentence and substituting the following: "The following rules for preventing collisions shall be followed in the navigation of all public and private vessels of the United States upon the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as Montreal and in the navigation of all other vessels upon such lakes and waters while within the territorial waters of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of February 8, 1895 (ch. 64, 28 Stat. 649; 33 U. S. C. 244), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Every licensed or unlicensed pilot, engineer, mate, or master of any vessel subject to section 1 of this act who neglects or refuses to observe the provisions of this act or the regulations established pursuant hereto shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$500.

"(b) Every private vessel subject to section 1 of this act that shall be navigated without complying with the provisions of this act or the regulations established pursuant hereto shall be liable to a penalty of \$500, for which sum such vessel may be seized and proceeded against by way of libel in any district court of the United States of any district within which such vessel may be found."

SEC. 3. Sections 4412 and 4413 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (46 U. S. C. 381) are hereby repealed.

LIGHTS FOR VESSELS TOWING OR BEING OVERTAKEN

The bill (S. 2115) to amend the act of June 7, 1897, as amended, and section 4233 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to lights for vessels towing or being overtaken, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That article 3 of section 1 of the act of June 7, 1897, as amended (30 Stat. 97, as amended; U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 33, sec. 173), is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 3. (a) A steam vessel when towing another vessel or vessels alongside or by pushing ahead shall, in addition to her side lights, carry 2 bright white lights in a vertical line, one over the other, not less than 3 feet apart, and when towing one or more vessels astern, regardless of the length of the tow, shall carry an additional bright white light 3 feet above or below such lights. Each of these lights shall be of the same construction and character, and shall be carried in the same position as the white light mentioned in article 2 (a) or the after range light mentioned in article 2 (f).

"(b) A steam vessel carrying towing lights the same as the white light mentioned in article 2 (a), when pushing another vessel or vessels ahead, shall also carry at or near the stern 2 bright amber lights in a vertical line, one over the other, not less than 3 feet apart; each of these lights shall be so constructed as to show an unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 12 points of the compass, so fixed as to show the light 6 points from right aft on each side of the vessel, and of such a character as to be visible at a distance of at least 2 miles. A steam vessel carrying towing lights the same as the white light mentioned in article 2 (a) may also carry, irrespective of the position of the tow, the after range light mentioned in article 2 (f); however, if the after range light is carried by such a vessel when pushing another vessel or vessels ahead, the amber lights shall be carried in a vertical line with and at least 3 feet lower than the after range light. A steam vessel carrying towing lights the same as the white light mentioned in article 2 (a), when towing one or more vessels astern, may also carry, in lieu of the stern light specified in article 10, a small white light abaft the funnel or aftermast for the tow to steer by, but such light shall not be visible forward of the beam."

SEC. 2. Article 10 of section 1 of the act of June 7, 1897, as amended (30 Stat. 98; U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 33, sec. 179), is amended to read as follows:

"ART. 10. (a) A vessel when under way, if not otherwise required by these rules to carry one or more lights visible from aft, shall carry at her stern a white light, so constructed that it shall show an unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 12 points of the compass, so fixed as to show the light 6 points from right aft on each side of the vessel, and of such a character as to be visible at a distance of at least 2 miles. Such light shall be carried as nearly as practicable on the same level as the side lights.

"(b) In a small vessel, if it is not possible on account of bad weather or other sufficient cause for the light to be fixed, an electric torch or a lighted lantern shall be kept at hand ready for use and shall, on the approach of an overtaking vessel, be shown in sufficient time to prevent collision."

SEC. 3. Section (d) of rule No. 3 of section 4233 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1952

edition, title 33, sec. 312), is amended to read as follows:

"(d) At or near the stern, where they can best be seen, 2 amber lights in a vertical line, one over the other, not less than 3 feet apart, of such a character as to be visible from aft for a distance of at least 2 miles, and so screened as not to be visible forward of the beam."

SEC. 4. Rule No. 10 of section 4233 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 33, sec. 319), is amended to read as follows:

"Rule No. 10: (a) A vessel when under way, if not otherwise required by these rules to carry one or more lights visible from aft, shall carry at her stern a white light, so constructed that it shall show an unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 12 points of the compass, so fixed as to show the light 6 points from right aft on each side of the vessel, and of such a character as to be visible at a distance of at least 2 miles. Such light shall be carried as nearly as practicable on the same level as the side lights.

"(b) In a small vessel, if it is not possible on account of bad weather or other sufficient cause for this light to be fixed, an electric torch or a lighted lantern shall be kept at hand ready for use and shall, on the approach of an overtaking vessel, be shown in sufficient time to prevent collision."

EQUITABLE TREATMENT FOR PRO- DUCERS PARTICIPATING IN THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2937) to provide equitable treatment for producers participating in the Soil Bank program on the basis of incorrect information furnished by the Government, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"COMPENSATION FOR INCORRECT INFORMATION FURNISHED UNDER 1956 PROGRAM

"SEC. 127. In any case under the 1956 program in which a producer, in reliance, in good faith, on incorrect or incomplete information furnished to him by an authorized representative of the Secretary, entered into an acreage reserve or conservation reserve contract, or took action with the intention of entering into such a contract, and the producer is not entitled to receive under the provisions of the program the payment which was stipulated in the contract, or which would have been stipulated if a contract had been entered into the Secretary is hereby authorized, whenever he deems it desirable in order to provide fair and equitable treatment to such a producer, to compensate such producer for any loss suffered by him as a result of action taken for the purpose of participating in the program."

MR. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

MR. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill has received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It also has received the approval of the Department of Agriculture, which suggested some technical improvements which would be adopted by the committee amendment. The bill simply authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate producers for hardships suffered under the 1956 Soil

Bank program as a result of incorrect information furnished by county committees. The 1956 program was put into effect hurriedly, after the Agricultural Act of 1956 was approved; and a number of mistakes occurred. In some cases the producer was given incorrect information as to the size of his allotment. In others, the Department's measurement of his acreage turned out to be incorrect. Examples of the types of mistakes covered are set out on pages 1, 2, and 3 of the committee report. These mistakes were not the farmers' mistakes, and the farmers should not be required to suffer for them.

The committee amendment, which was suggested by the Department of Agriculture, makes no change in substance in the bill, but was suggested by the Department and adopted by the committee as a clearer statement of the provisions of the bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HUNGRY HORSE DAM, MONT.

The bill (S. 847) to amend the act of June 5, 1944, relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hungry Horse Dam, Mont., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to clarify the status of the Hungry Horse project, Montana, section 1 of the act of June 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 270, 43 U. S. C. 593a), is hereby amended by adding to it a new sentence reading as follows:

"The Hungry Horse project shall be subject to the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto)."

COMPACTS BETWEEN STATES OF NEBRASKA, WYOMING, AND SOUTH DAKOTA

The bill (S. 2557) to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain compacts by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota, in order to extend the time for such negotiations, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota of certain compacts with respect to the use of waters common to two or more of said States," approved August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 365), is amended by striking out "5 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "8 years."

TRANSFER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF PROPERTY IN PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2813) to provide for certain credits to the Salt River Valley Water

Users Association and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District in consideration of the transfer to the Government of property in Phoenix, Ariz., which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Arizona", to insert "as evidenced by an acceptable abstract of title, certificate of title, or title guaranty policy"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "building", to insert "that the Attorney General of the United States has rendered a written opinion in favor of the validity of the title"; in line 5, after the word "accepted", to strike out "the tender" and insert "a warranty deed, in form approved by the Attorney General and with documentary stamps thereto attached in amounts required by law, conveying the unencumbered fee simple title to the properties therein described to the United States of America,"; and in line 19, after the word "District", to strike out the comma and "or so much of said amount as is not paid in cash or other valuable considerations" and insert a colon and "Provided, That if said amount is in excess of said obligations, the difference may be paid in cash or other valuable considerations,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon certification by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior that the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District has tendered to the United States marketable title to certain properties in the city of Phoenix, Ariz., as evidenced by an acceptable abstract of title, certificate of title, or title guaranty policy now owned by it which are necessary for, or reasonably useful in connection with, a new Federal courthouse and office building, that the Attorney General of the United States has rendered a written opinion in favor of the validity of the title and that the Administrator, acting on behalf of the United States, has accepted a warranty deed, in form approved by the Attorney General and with documentary stamps thereto attached in amounts required by law, conveying the unencumbered fee simple title to the properties therein described to the United States of America, the Secretary shall credit toward repayment of such of the obligations assumed by the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District under the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) as he finds proper an amount equal to the value of the properties transferred, as determined by an appraisal satisfactory to the Administrator, the Secretary, and the Salt River project agricultural improvement and power district: *Provided*, That if said amount is in excess of said obligations, the difference may be paid in cash or other valuable considerations.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF CIVIL AVIATION

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) favoring Congressional recognition of the 20th anniversary of civil aviation under the Civil Aeronautics Act of

1938, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States, on this 20th anniversary of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, reaffirms its support of the policies set forth therein; and urges strict adherence to policies which will enable civil aviation to solve its present economic and technical problems and assure the public of the benefits of a strong air transport system and civil aviation industry.

The preamble was agreed to.

INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The resolution (S. Res. 272) authorizing an increase in expenditures for the Committee on Foreign Relations was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 85th Congress, \$10,000, in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946, and Senate Resolution 152, agreed to July 3, 1957.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO ELEANOR N. GAGG

The resolution (S. Res. 275) to pay a gratuity to Eleanor N. Gagg was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Eleanor N. Gagg, widow of William H. Gagg, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 7½ months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF THE SENATE, IF NEEDED

The resolution (S. Res. 276) providing additional funds for the Official Reporters of the Senate was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate, to the Official Reporters of the Senate debates and proceedings, during the period March 1, 1958, to December 31, 1958, so much as may be necessary, not to exceed \$10,000, for the employment of additional office personnel.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS RELATING TO ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF MARIA L. SANFORD

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 71) to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of Maria L. Sanford, late of Minnesota, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Maria L. Sanford, to be presented on November 12, 1958, by the State of Minnesota in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustra-

tions and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed 5,000 additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which 100 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,900 copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of Minnesota, and 500 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 2,500 copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota.

REVISION OF FISH AND GAME LAWS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 532) to revise and modernize the fish and game laws of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Commissioners are authorized to restrict, prohibit, regulate, and control hunting and fishing and the taking, possession and sale of wild animals in the District: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall authorize the Commissioners to impose any requirement for a fishing license or fee of any nature whatsoever: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall authorize the Commissioners to prohibit, restrict, regulate, or control the killing, capture, purchase, sale, or possession of migratory birds as defined in regulations issued pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918, as amended (16 U. S. C. 703-711), and taken for scientific, propagating, or other purposes under permits issued by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall authorize the Commissioners to prohibit, restrict, regulate or control the sale or possession of wild animals taken legally in any State, Territory or possession of the United States or in any foreign country, or produced on a game farm, except as may be necessary to protect the public health or safety. As used in this section the term "wild animals" includes, without limitation, mammals, birds, fish, and reptiles not ordinarily domesticated.

Sec. 2. Authorized officers and employees of the Government of the United States or of the government of the District of Columbia are, for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this act and the regulations promulgated by the Commissioners under the authority of this act, empowered, during business hours, to inspect any building or premises in or on which any business, trade, vocation or occupation requiring a license or permit is carried on, or any vehicle, boat, market box, market stall or cold-storage plant. No person shall refuse to permit any such inspection.

Sec. 3. (a) All rifles, shotguns, ammunition, bows, arrows, traps, seines, nets, boats, and other devices of every nature or description used by any person within the District of Columbia when engaged in killing, ensnaring, trapping, or capturing any wild bird, wild mammal, or fish contrary to this act or any regulation made pursuant to this act shall be seized by any police officer upon the arrest of such person on a charge of violating any provision of this act or any regulations made pursuant thereto, and be delivered to the Commissioners. If the person so arrested is acquitted, the property so seized shall be returned to the person in whose possession it was found. If the person so

arrested is convicted, the property so seized shall, in the discretion of the court, be forfeited to the District of Columbia, and be sold at public auction, the proceeds from such sale to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia. If any item of such property is not purchased at such auction, it shall be disposed of in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioners.

(b) If any property seized under the authority of this section is subject to a lien which is established by intervention or otherwise to the satisfaction of the court as having been created without the lienor's having any notice that such property was to be used in connection with a violation of any provision of this act or any regulation made pursuant thereto, the court, upon the conviction of the accused, may order a sale of such property at public auction. The officer conducting such sale, after deducting proper fees and costs incident to the seizure, keeping, and sale of such property, shall pay all such liens according to their priorities, and such lien or liens shall be transferred from the property to the proceeds of the sale thereof.

SEC. 4. (a) Any person convicted of violating any provision of this act, or any regulation made pursuant to this act, shall be fined not more than \$300 or imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both.

(b) Prosecutions for violations of this act, or the regulations made pursuant thereto, shall be conducted in the name of the District of Columbia by the Corporation Counsel or any of his assistants.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioners, respectively, are authorized to delegate any of the functions to be performed by them under the authority of this act.

(b) The Commissioners are authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That any regulations issued pursuant to this act shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior insofar as they involve any areas or waters of the District of Columbia under his administrative jurisdiction.

(c) As used in this act the word "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent or agents, and the words "Secretary of the Interior" mean the Secretary of the Interior or his designated agent or agents.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act or in any regulation promulgated by the Commissioners under the authority of this act shall in any way impair the existing authority of the Secretary of the Interior to control and manage fish and wildlife on the land and waters in the District of Columbia under his administrative jurisdiction.

SEC. 7. Section 902 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1336), as amended (title 22, secs. 1607 and 1703, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 902. Penalties: Any person who shall violate any provision of the preceding section shall for each such offense be fined not more than \$300 or imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both."

SEC. 8. The following acts or parts of acts are repealed:

(a) Sections 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, and 903 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1335, 1336), as amended (title 22, secs. 1601, 1602, 1604, 1605, 1606, and 1608, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

(b) Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1012), as amended (title 22, secs. 1609-1620, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

(c) Sections 1, 2, 3, and 5 of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 808), as amended (title 22, secs. 1621-1624, D. C. Code, 1951 edition);

(d) Sections 1 through 3 of the act approved December 18, 1919 (41 Stat. 368; title 22, secs. 1625-1627, D. C. Code, 1951 edition); and

(e) Sections 1 through 4 of the act approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1379; title 22, sec. 1603, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

SEC. 9. This act shall take effect on the 180th day following the approval thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3100) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment on page 2, line 7, to strike out "transportation" and insert "transportation, unless the Secretary of Commerce determines that United States flag service is available to provide such transportation", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1959, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passengers and merchandise may be transported on Canadian vessels between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation, unless the Secretary of Commerce determines that United States flag service is available to provide such transportation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 11086) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this bill is not properly calendar business, and I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PETRIFIED FOREST NATIONAL PARK, ARIZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 1381, Senate bill 2359, which earlier today was ordered placed at the foot of the calendar, will now be called.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2359) to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over. Perhaps it can be

brought up later in the day, by motion. The corresponding House bill has not yet arrived at the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will go over. That concludes the call of the calendar.

PROCUREMENT OF ARTICLES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT

During the consideration of S. 3243, relating to attendance by certain foreign students at the District of Columbia Teachers College,

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, when the pending bill has been acted on, I shall address the Senate on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from West Virginia that under the rule the Senate is now engaged in the call of the calendar. The call will be continued through to completion, with each Senator having the right to object or reserve the right to object, and to speak on a measure for 5 minutes, or to speak on any other subject for 5 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I understand correctly that Senators are permitted to seek recognition for 5 minutes in order to speak on any subject during the call of the calendar? I understand that to be the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope our good friend, the Senator from West Virginia, will permit us to complete the call of the calendar before he speaks on an extraneous subject. The calendar is quite short today, and we have every expectation of completing its call within 10 or 15 minutes. There are several Senators on the floor who are interested in the call of the calendar. Recognizing the complete right of the Senator from West Virginia to speak on an extraneous matter, I hope he will let us conclude the call of the calendar before he speaks on such a matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is always my pleasure to comply with the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania. However, what I desire to say is very short and will not take more than a few minutes, and will not delay the Senate unduly. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed in the RECORD at the end of the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to make a very brief statement on a subject which I consider to be very important at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, positive action is being taken on several fronts by both the administration and the Congress to speed economic recovery.

Another important step that would not require Congressional action would be for the President of the United States to invoke section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1957, as amended.

A large percentage of the commodities procured by the International Cooperation Administration under the mutual security program are being purchased abroad. In many instances, perhaps, they can be purchased cheaper in foreign countries. However, in view of the unemployment that exists in this country at the present time, it is my feeling that such purchases should be made in this country. Congress made specific provision for this course of action in adopting the Mutual Security Act of 1957. Section 510 of that act reads:

Funds made available under title 2 or chapter 3 of title 1 of this act may be used for the procurement of commodities outside the United States unless the President determines that such procurement will result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus, or upon the industrial mobilization base, which outweighs the economic advantages to the United States of less costly procurement abroad.

I point out that under this language the President is authorized to act, and if he determines "that such procurement will result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus," such purchases should be made in this country.

We are confronted with such a situation today. Because of present conditions, there is every justification, I feel, for invoking this provision. It is my understanding that purchases of commodities under the mutual security program are being made at the rate of more than \$1 billion a year. If the purchase of such materials were made in this country, many additional jobs would be provided.

The coal industry in my own State clearly illustrates the importance of such action. Coal production has declined substantially in recent months, and unemployment in many areas is becoming a serious problem. The situation facing the coal industry, the steel industry, and other American productions is such that, to my mind, it clearly justifies invoking section 510 of the Mutual Security Act.

It is my feeling that the commodities we need at this time should be purchased from our domestic producers. This is particularly important now when every sound step possible should be taken to speed an upturn in business activity. Surely such a step would be understood by other countries. We would continue to assist them with the aid provided under the Mutual Security Act for our joint strength and defense.

I have written a letter to the President of the United States, urging that this action be taken promptly. It is my hope that the President will invoke section 510 of the Mutual Security Act so that American industries may receive

the full benefit from this phase of the foreign aid program, and I have urged that this be done. Such action would be in keeping with the other steps which are being taken to check any recession in our economy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 42, section 2251, United States Code, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Aspinall, of Colorado, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2042) to authorize the conveyance of a fee simple title to certain lands in the Territory of Alaska underlying war housing project Alaska-50083, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8250) to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOB-LITZELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPANSION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators SPARKMAN, HILL, MONROE, PROXMIER, COOPER, CLARK, LONG, YARBOROUGH, and SMATHERS, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk until the close of business tomorrow in order that any Senator desiring to add his name as a co-sponsor may be permitted to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The bill (S. 3497) to expand the public facility loan program of the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a short statement explaining the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSAL TO EXPAND EXISTING PUBLIC FACILITIES LOAN PROGRAM FOR LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS, BY BROADENING SCOPE AND LOWERING INTEREST RATE

BACKGROUND

To counteract the recession, Congress is acting to accelerate Federal public works. It is proposed also to accelerate local public works, not by PWA approach, but through expanding and liberalizing existing loan program, to take off the shelf existing backlog of projects. Federal projects are usually large-scale, relatively few. Even when planning is complete, there is a necessary delay for organization and assembly of money, men, material, and machines. Local projects exist in virtually every community. There is a huge backlog because of war, inflation, and tight money. Two hundred and sixty million dollars worth of such projects, for which Federal Government advanced planning funds, have plans completed and are ready for construction. Projects costing approximately \$366 million have received Federal planning advances, and plans are now under way. Another \$500 million is represented by applications pending for planning fund advances. These figures do not include projects launched without Federal planning advances, and which may be ready for financing.

EXISTING FEDERAL PROGRAM FOR ASSISTANCE TO PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING AND FINANCING

(Administered by Community Facilities Administration of HHFA, an existing operating unit, with offices and programs throughout United States.)

1. Planning: Interest-free advances to provide a shelf of local public works. Forty-eight million dollars authorized as of July 1, 1958. Seventeen million dollars appropriated to date. Advances repaid when projects begin.

2. Public facilities loans; loans to, and purchase of obligations of, States and local political subdivisions to finance projects.

DEFECTS OF PRESENT LOAN PROGRAM

1. Practically limited to communities of 5,000 and under for water and sewer systems.

2. Interest rates of 4½ percent on general obligation bonds, 4½ percent revenue bonds, 30-year maturity, make loans attractive only to communities with worst credit ratings.

3. Only \$100 million authorization.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROPOSED LOAN PROGRAM

1. Expand project eligibility: Construction repair, and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, and other transportation facilities; public parks and other public recreational facilities; public hospitals; rehabilitation and health centers; public refuse and garbage disposal facilities; water, sewage, and sanitary facilities, and other public utility facilities; public police and fire protection facilities; public schools, libraries, offices, and other public buildings; and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities.

2. Set interest rate at maximum of one-fourth of 1 percent above average rate on all Government debt. (Results in present rate of 3 percent, same as college housing loans.) Compare sample recent private rates of:

	Percent
Top grade (Concord, N. H.)	2.80
AA (Memphis, Tenn.)	3.00
A (New York, N. Y., and Fort Smith, Ark.)	3.20
BAA (Hot Springs, Ark.)	3.85

Three percent rate for this program would tend to bring down interest rates, specifically for this type financing and generally throughout economy.

3. Increase authorization from \$100 million to \$2 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, both the Congress and the administration are taking action to accelerate Federal public works programs.

On March 12, under the leadership of the Senator from Texas, the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senate passed a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Congress that construction programs for which funds have been appropriated should be accelerated to the greatest practicable extent, to promote economic recovery. However, little, if anything, has been done to accelerate local public works.

I do not think it is necessary, for purposes of this statement, to argue the nature and extent of the recession which our economy is now undergoing. It seems to be generally acknowledged that the Federal Government should act to counteract the recession. The only argument seems to be as to the nature and timing of the steps which the Government must take.

Over a month ago the New York Times summarized the views of Prof. Arthur F. Burns, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, as follows:

Professor Burns believes that the recession which began after the peak in July and August 1957 will continue at least for some weeks or months. The contraction will not be ended by a revival of business investment, of export demand, or any other economic development but only by "massive" Government intervention.

The Joint Economic Committee on February 27 called for expanded programs for Federal and local public works to stimulate economic activity and to contribute to long-run growth.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has proposed a bill, S. 3231, to create a Public Works Administration, which would make grants in the ratio of 90 percent Federal money to 10 percent State or local funds for local public works.

On March 9, in a letter to the minority leaders of the Congress, the President expressed his concern over the PWA approach. If I correctly understand the position of the majority leader on this issue, he proposes that the Senate decide whether or not to establish a Public Works Administration on a standby basis, or, as he puts it on March 12, "to engage in long-term planning and to be ready to go in the event a large scale public works program becomes essential." I think this is a wise precaution under the present circum-

stances. I do not think it is desirable that a Public Works Administration be put into actual operation at the present time. However, we are not limited to the alternatives of a PWA, on the one hand, or nothing on the other.

What I propose here is a more moderate and intermediate approach to accelerate local public-works projects.

While large scale Federal public works programs, such as the development of rivers and harbors, flood-control projects, highways, and Federal buildings, make great contributions to our economic well-being, so also can State and local projects such as public streets, sidewalks, roads, bridges, waterworks, parking lots, recreational facilities, hospital, sewer systems, fire-protection facilities, schools, libraries, and so on. Undoubtedly, as a result of war, inflation, and credit restraints, there is a great backlog of need for these facilities.

As desirable as large scale Federal public works are—and I, of course, think that they are—and even though planning may be complete, I question whether they can have as immediate an effect as many smaller local public projects such as those I have described. Large-scale works require time for the assembly of large numbers of professional, managerial, and working people, large amounts of material and money, transportation facilities, and equipment. Many smaller projects can be put into operation immediately, with smaller problems of organization, if financing is ready. Because of the greater number of them, however, they can have a great revivifying effect upon the total economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am very much interested in the Senator's excellent proposal. I shall do all I can to see that it receives consideration by the Senate at the earliest possible date.

I have two questions I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas. First, does he have any indication of how many—and in what dollar amount—applications are pending in cases in which plans have already been made and the projects could be put into operation immediately?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Five hundred and five plans have been approved, with a projected cost of more than \$666 million. There are under review 144 applications, which involve another \$513 million. Of course, every one of them will not be approved, but those 2 categories would total \$1,180,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What the Senator is saying is that if the authority he seeks in his bill should be granted, we could expect, from applications already on file, more than \$1 billion worth of applications would have to be considered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, there would be more than \$1 billion worth. I may say many others made plans without having borrowed money from this particular program, which are also ready to establish their eligibility for loans.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the Federal Government has authorized appropriations of \$48 million for advances to State and local governments for planning purposes. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The authorization, under Public Law 354, 84th Congress, was \$48 million.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And only \$17 million of that authorization has been appropriated. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But under the \$17 million which have been appropriated there has been submitted to the Federal agency, the agency already in existence, in excess of \$1 billion worth of projects for which plans have already been made or are ready to be made. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Congress, in its wisdom, should appropriate the difference between what has been appropriated and what it has authorized, namely, the difference between \$17 million and \$48 million, or \$31 million, then we could expect substantial applications as a result, could we not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For planning, that is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume the Senator will urge upon the Congress that it advance money at the earliest practical date, in the first appropriation bill, to provide advance planning money, so that it can be loaned to the cities and the political divisions desiring it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I shall come to that point later in my remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the Senator introduced a bill which would prescribe a certain limit on the funds which will be loaned?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have just introduced the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much lending authority is provided?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Two billion dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When does the Senator expect to have hearings on the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have just cleared with the ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], arrangements to have the first hearing on Wednesday afternoon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand the Senator contemplates that all these funds will be handled under an existing agency. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The existing agency is a constituent unit of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It is called the Community Facilities Administration. It has been engaged in these types of planning and lending functions for some years now. As a matter of fact, this was a continuation, in a sense, of an activity which used to exist under the RFC, which was of great help to small communities.

By law and administrative action I may say, it has been restricted to the very small communities, partly because it was felt such communities were the

ones needing it the most and there was no need for expanding the program.

The whole planning activity was intended to make ready plans for exactly such an emergency or contingency as that with which we are now faced because of which there is the need to step up public works.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, there is no grant involved in the Senator's proposal, but it is all on a loan basis?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is a loan program. The bill proposes to make the funds available under the same interest-rate formula we used in the college-housing program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What about the interest rate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the formula to which I refer. The interest rate is arrived at under the formula of the college-housing program, which we debated at great length last year. That is a formula which we believe does not cost the Government anything.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I remember, we had a yea and nay vote on that matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the proposal provide that the borrower shall pay the Federal Government the going interest rate, plus one-quarter of 1 percent?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is the average interest rate of all the outstanding Government obligations, plus one-quarter of 1 percent for administrative costs. That is, stated very briefly, the formula.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I congratulate the Senator for his vision and his foresight. I think he has presented a very constructive proposal. I hope the committee will hold hearings at the earliest possible date and that the hearings will be thorough and conclusive. I look forward to the time when the Senator will report the bill from his committee, by a bipartisan vote, for consideration by the entire membership of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield in a moment.

I thank the majority leader for his remarks. I might say that I do not think I deserve all the credit. I believe this is a good example of the foresight of the Congress in passing the law in the 84th Congress which continued this planning activity. All the bill which I have introduced seeks to do is, so to speak, to carry the program on through to its logical conclusion and to put into effect what the previous bill anticipated, and for which I think it very wisely made provision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am willing to have the Senator from Arkansas share the credit with the entire Congress. I wish to congratulate him for taking the initiative, for making a very able speech, and for submitting the proposal as well as fixing a date for hearings on it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am happy the Senator has taken that action.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to point out that this is an example of what I call foresight on the part of the Congress, in looking down the line ahead to anticipate the day when we could use the plans, encouraging communities to make them, and supplying a small amount of money to help them do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The proposed legislation the Senator from Arkansas is discussing, for which he would now have the Congress authorize up to \$2 billion in loans, was introduced by the late Senator Maybank and the Senator from Indiana. The purpose at the time was to provide loans of money to communities affected by Government action. The Government was building Army camps or atomic energy plants, and of course the communities did not have sufficient funds to pay immediately the necessary costs, as a result of the heavy load thrown upon them.

If I remember correctly, the program really started because of an atomic energy plant being constructed in South Carolina, in connection with which the Government took over thousands and thousands of acres and made it necessary to move a number of cities and towns. When the towns moved, of course, they did not have sufficient money to build the community facilities, so we passed the law which provided that the Federal Government loan them money.

The law has been in effect for some time. As I say, that legislation was introduced by me and the late Senator Maybank, when the late Senator Maybank was chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

However, I want to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that we are now talking in terms of \$2 billion of Federal money to be used for the purpose of stopping a recession which in my best judgment has already spent its course. If we will exercise just a little patience and give the things which the Congress and the President have started, time to work, we will—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not believe I care to yield to the Senator so that he may expound upon that subject. I wish to finish my statement, and then the Senator can criticize it in any way he desires.

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate the feelings of the able Senator. I should like to say one thing before I sit down. I am afraid there is going to be an opportunity for large sales of liniment for backs, because Senators on the other side of the aisle are bowing to each other and congratulating each other on new theories.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator may expound further upon that subject. I do not care to yield at this time for that purpose.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator never cares to yield when he is being hurt.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not care to yield for that purpose.

I should like to say that the able Senator from Indiana has expressed his views before on the state of our economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. I notice that the Senators on the other side are making very, very deep bows.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The record as to the origin of this kind of legislation is also quite clear.

Mr. President, the Federal Government for many years has had programs to assist State and local governments and their political subdivisions in the planning and financing of such facilities. Various Government agencies in the past have participated in this responsibility. Some of the loan programs which were formerly administered by the RFC have been continued, along with other programs of other agencies, in the Community Facilities Administration, a constituent unit of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This Administration is existing, active, and operating, with offices and programs throughout the United States. We do not need a new agency to facilitate local public works. Among the programs it administers are:

First. Advances for public works planning: A program of interest-free advances to provide a shelf of planned public works which might be placed under construction quickly should the economic situation make such action desirable.

Second. Public facility loans: A program to provide loans or to purchase the securities and obligations of States and their local political subdivisions and instrumentalities and public agencies, corporations, and commissions established under State laws to finance specific public projects.

The bill I am proposing has as its purpose to take off the shelf this backlog of planned public works, and through the public-facility-loan program put them under construction. Of course, it would also enable the construction of many projects planned without Federal advances, and others which have not yet been planned. Undoubtedly, there are many of these programs which also have been on the shelf because of credit restrictions or for other reasons, but which are vitally needed.

The public facility loan program, as I have said, has been in operation for a number of years. However, a system of priorities has been established which, in fact, has limited its usefulness. It has been useful recently only to the smallest communities with the worst credit ratings, and for only a few kinds of projects. The interest presently charged is $4\frac{1}{8}$ percent for 30-year general obligation bonds and 4 percent for 30-year revenue bonds. These rates may be compared with the following sample interest rates on municipal bonds of recent date. Top grade—Concord, N. H., 2.8 percent; AA—Memphis, Tenn., 3 percent; A—New York City and Fort Smith, Ark., 3.2 percent; and BAA—Hot Springs, Ark., 3.85 percent. Other recent bond issues of municipalities have sold at various rates. For example, a recent rate paid by Little Rock, Ark., was 3.03 percent,

and Quitman, Ark., a very small town, 4.5 percent. These rates are for general obligation bonds. Revenue bonds usually require interest rates of approximately one-fourth of 1 percent higher.

A comparison of these sample rates with those charged under the present public facility loan program will illustrate why the latter program is of limited use under its present interest rate requirements.

The bill I am introducing would apply the interest rate formula under the college housing loan program to the public facility loan program, resulting in a maximum applicable rate at present of 3 percent. I believe this would be of substantial help to many municipalities, and it would also tend to bring down interest rates, specifically for these types of securities, and generally throughout the economy.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator will recall that some years ago—in 1955, to be exact—the junior Senator from Louisiana, along with other Senators, was urging that we should revive this program, whereby loans would be made available to the small communities. Such a provision was subsequently incorporated as an amendment in the housing bill which was passed that year.

The limitations which caused this program to be available primarily to small cities were placed in the legislation because that was about the only thing we could hope to get at that time.

I believe the Senator will recall that the RFC had been abolished, and many people were contending that the Government should not lend money if the money could be found elsewhere.

Many of us pointed out at that time that many small cities simply could not obtain loans. Therefore we established a \$100 million revolving fund, and made that fund available to the small communities, which in many instances were unable to obtain credit.

As I understand, what the Senator is proposing is that this program should be made available today more broadly, and that those limitations should be removed. I agree that that is a good proposal, so long as we have available enough funds to enable more people to be cared for. As I understand, the Senator states that such would be the result. Funds would be available not only for the small cities, but for the larger ones as well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Louisiana is quite correct.

I compliment him for the part he played in keeping this program alive in the instance to which he refers. He has always shown a great interest in helping communities in this fashion, and he has always had a very great and effective interest in keeping the interest rate as low as possible.

I believe the proposed interest rate is fair. At least, in my view, it does not involve any subsidy on the part of the Government. It takes into consideration the average cost of all Federal bor-

rowings, and adds one-quarter of 1 percent for administrative costs. So I think it reimburses the Government for its out-of-pocket costs.

The Senator from Louisiana is quite correct in that the program takes into consideration the plans which have been made, and any other plans local communities have, and makes available money at reasonable cost.

I congratulate the Senator on his foresight in 1955, in foreseeing that this program would become very useful in the future.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I wish to join him in sponsoring the bill. I am sure it would be a very substantial advantage to our economy if it were enacted at this time. In the event this program is undertaken as an emergency measure, I hope it will not inadvertently lead to a discontinuation of the earlier program, which I believe should be continued in good times and bad. We should see that smaller communities always have available to them some agency to which they can go if credit is not otherwise available for essential sanitary facilities and things of that kind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. I invite attention to the fact that under the terms of the bill even the small communities now taking advantage of the law would get a lower interest rate.

Mr. LONG. That is extremely desirable.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am most intrigued by the proposal being explained by the Senator from Arkansas. I should like to make several inquiries as to the particulars of the program.

Is there any limit as to the population or assessed valuation of a community which may be eligible under the proposed program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no limitation in the bill. If the Senator is referring to local limitations, under which many cities are placed by State law, I do not know about that situation. But there is no limitation in the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, my home community of Portland, Oreg., with a population of 420,000 to 430,000, would be eligible to seek loans under the terms of the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask about one particular type of program which is of a special interest and urgency to my State. We are distressingly far behind in the cleaning up of stream pollution, and providing sanitary districts to take care of sewage. This is of particular significance in Oregon, where we have such valuable migratory fish runs, which have been imperiled and jeopardized because rivers are full of sewage and chemical wastes of one kind or another. I should like to ask the Senator—although I think I can anticipate what his reply will be—whether or not the loans he has in mind would be available for projects to clean up rivers, and to help dispose of sewage.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my belief that they would. There is this language in the bill: "and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities."

In the existing program sewage and water facilities have been two of the most eligible types of projects.

Mr. NEUBERGER. And most useful.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And most useful. I certainly think the kind of program mentioned by the Senator would be eligible under the terms of the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator.

I do not know whether the Senator from Arkansas welcomes cosponsors. If he does, I shall be glad to join as a cosponsor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I announced before the Senator entered the Chamber that I would welcome cosponsors. The bill will remain on the desk until tomorrow for the purpose of adding the names of additional cosponsors.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would feel privileged to be listed as a cosponsor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point which I think is particularly important is that these programs, large and small, many of which have already been planned, could be put into operation sooner than many comparable public-works activities. I favor the construction of dams in the Senator's State and in other States as soon as possible. However, it is quite obvious that many small projects could get under way much more quickly than the larger ones.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator has a valid point.

Only a few weeks ago I was visited by Paul C. Northrop, roadmaster in Multnomah County, Oreg., in which Portland is located. He pointed out that an effort is being made to mobilize a tri-county sanitary district to take care of suburbs which are spread out from Portland, where sewage conditions are very deplorable because the population has grown so much faster than have the necessary plants to dispose of the waste. He emphasized how useful it would be if there were some Federal agency which could provide loans for this purpose at a relatively low rate of interest, so that the carrying charge would not be unbearable from the standpoint of the taxpayers.

The Senator has a very cogent point, and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of his bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The formula for the interest rate in the bill is arrived at by adding one-fourth of 1 percent to the average interest rate on all Government obligations at the end of the month preceding the borrowing. Thus, the borrower would be charged an interest rate on the basis of the cost of Government borrowings, plus one-fourth of 1 percent for administrative expenses.

The bill would also increase the amount available to the Community Facilities Administration from \$100 million to \$2 billion. It would direct the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Community Facilities Administration to assist in the immediate construction of essential public works and public facilities which would enhance the health

and welfare of the public of the United States and would reduce unemployment and stimulate business activity. The loans made under the amended statute could run for as long as 50 years, and, in some instances, up to 55 years.

Another provision of the bill would authorize the postponement of the principal repayments up to 5 years, or postponement of all payments of principal and interest up to 5 years; but, if interest were so postponed, it would be added to the interest due over the balance of the life of the loan.

The status on the advanced planning program of the Community Facilities Administration is indicated by the following table. The table also indicates the immediate impact this bill could have by providing financing for the backlog, or shelf, of projects which have received advance planning grants and are ready for construction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table, showing the figures I discussed a moment ago with the majority leader, be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Program of advances for public works planning—Status as of Feb. 28, 1958

Million

Total authorization, Public Law 345, 84th Cong. . . . \$48
 Authorization available as of July 1, 1957 (additional \$14 million available July 1, 1958) 34
 Actual appropriation to date 17

	Number	Planning funds	Estimated project cost
Applications approved (net)	505	\$11,492,504	\$666,523,727
Applications under review	144	5,773,674	513,980,974
Total		17,266,178	1,180,504,701
Plans completed	263	4,336,275	290,618,857
Advances repaid	40	701,690	40,013,911

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This table shows that first, projects costing approximately \$260 million are already planned and ready for construction; second, projects costing approximately \$366 million have received Federal planning advances and planning has started; and, third, projects costing over \$500 million are being reviewed for advances of Federal planning funds. This table does not account for local projects which have been launched without Federal help but which may be in need of favorable financing.

This table also reveals that appropriations for planning advances are inadequate to permit approval of applications now on hand. There are only \$17 million available, and approval of pending applications would require \$17,266,178—thus appropriated funds are practically exhausted as of March 1, 1958. I am advised that the President has requested \$8.5 million in planning funds for fiscal year 1959, but that no money for this purpose is contained in the 1958 second supplemental appropriation bill. I urge the Senate conferees on this bill to take note of this situation and to do whatever may be possible toward including additional planning funds in the second supplemental bill. If this is not possible, then such funds should certainly be provided as soon as possible.

I call attention to the fact that the authorization for such funds is already in existence.

On February 19 of this year, Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, was asked the following question:

Last year you will recall there were many—I do not recall whether you were one or not—who said that Federal, State, and local public works should be postponed to prevent adding to inflation. I wonder if you would agree that at this time there is no further need to keep the brakes on Federal, State, and local public works in view of the substantial decrease in spending in the private sector of the economy?

He replied as follows:

I would agree with that. I would say that there ought not to be at this juncture created works just for the sake of creating employment. They should be items that are needed and necessary and going to contribute something. They should not be just strawmen.

I agree with this view, and this bill is designed to accelerate necessary public works projects at the State and local levels. Many of these projects are already planned, and the Federal agency machinery is already established. By providing additional funds, at lower rates of interest, to launch these projects, the Federal Government can make a quick and fruitful investment in the general health and welfare of the Nation.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

SUMMARY OF A BILL ENTITLED "THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES ACT OF 1958"

The Community Facilities Act of 1958 provides that a \$2 billion revolving fund, from which the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency can make loans to States, or to cities, counties, and other State agencies, for the immediate construction of essential public works and public facilities.

This would be an expansion of an existing \$100 million revolving fund now being administered by the Community Facilities Administration.

The bill's declaration of policy states that the immediate construction of essential public works and public facilities by States and State agencies would enhance the health and welfare of the people of the United States and would reduce unemployment and stimulate business activity.

Loans could be made directly or in cooperation or participation with other lending agencies. Loans could not be made for operating expenses of the agency or project, nor could they be made if credit were otherwise available on equally favorable terms and conditions. Loans must be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment. Loans may run for up to 50 years. However, up to 5 annual installments of principal and interest may be deferred, and in such a case the maturity may run up to 55 years. The loan agreement may also provide, if the borrower wishes, for postponement of payments of principal or interest or both for up to 5 years. This would not reduce the total of principal and interest to be repaid.

The \$2 billion revolving fund may be borrowed from the Treasury, and interest must be paid to the Treasury at not more than the average annual interest rate on interest bearing Government obligations, at the end of the preceding month, adjusted to the

nearest one-eighth of 1 percent. The borrowers may be charged interest at not more than one-fourth of 1 percent over the rate paid to the Treasury. The interest charged the borrower, within these limits, is to be based on the need to promote the public works and facilities and stimulate business activity and employment.

The terms public works and public facilities are broadly defined. The following are included within the terms: construction, repair, and improvement of public streets, sidewalks, highways, parkways, bridges, parking lots, airports, and other transportation facilities; public parks and other public recreational facilities; public hospitals; rehabilitation and health centers; public refuse and garbage disposal facilities, water, sewage, and sanitary facilities, and other public utility facilities; public police and fire protection facilities; public schools, libraries, offices, and other public buildings; and public land, water, and timber conservation facilities.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 3497— COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF SENATE ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I announce, for the information of all Senators, and the public, that on Wednesday afternoon the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold a hearing on Senate bill 3497, to expand the public facility loan program, and that we shall invite representatives of the Community Facilities Administration to present information on the proposed legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, while the minority leader is on the floor, did I understand the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to say that he expected his committee to meet on Wednesday afternoon?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I made that announcement a moment ago. I had conferred with the ranking minority member of the committee, and it was agreeable to him. He so stated while he was on the floor a moment ago. He is agreeable to having the committee meet on Wednesday afternoon. I did not have a chance to speak to the minority leader or to the majority leader with respect to obtaining permission to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, if there is a session on that day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object in this instance—as a general rule, I believe it is preferable to obtain permission for such a meeting each day. However, in view of the statement just made, I shall not object on this occasion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not sure that we will have a session on Wednesday. The Senator from Texas would like to say that it is not inappropriate to ask for such unanimous consent at any time, but believes it is proper to make such a request at any time after the matter has been cleared

by both sides, so that the committee may make its plans, except, of course, in the event a minority member of the committee has objected, or the chairman of the committee does not desire to call such a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

EXPANSION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have joined the Senator from Arkansas in the introduction of the bill. I should like to state briefly my reasons. I agree wholeheartedly with the statement made by the senior Senator from Indiana. I have no doubt myself that in time—I do not know how long, but I believe within a reasonable time—the strong forces which are latent in our economy will assert themselves and that we will move on to new advances.

It cannot be denied that during the last 5 years new confidence in the economy of this country has been established. This is true because the administration has brought into balance expenditures and income, and for that reason enabled a tax cut which, while criticized at the time, has stimulated an investment, unparalleled in our history.

Within that ground, it should be realized that much that has been said during the last 3 weeks, while it expresses a proper regard for those who are out of work, and our desire they be put at work, an objective which all of us with human spirit should support, it does not take into account the real strength of the country. I have no doubt myself that the administration has taken steps—and other steps will be taken as needed—which have started the remarkable economic advance that we have had in the country in the last 5 years.

A few days ago some of us on this side of the aisle joined in a statement advocating antirecession steps. It might not have been interpreted correctly. We advocated that any programs which were in existence under existing governmental agencies and for which funds were available, and which could be immediately put into action, should be accelerated as started by us. We named the housing bill, highway construction, the allocation of contracts, and several other items. We did not exempt one need, even if it involved new expenditures. We urged that the Federal Government, as a matter of humanity, appropriate money to maintain unemployment insurance for those whose insurance had been exhausted. This was a matter to which the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] addressed himself last week.

I join the Senator from Arkansas on his bill for another reason. I believe the distinguished Senator would agree that his bill would not, if enacted, have any immediate effect on employment. Other expenditures such as housing, highway construction, and defense expenditures can have immediate effect, but the pro-

posal under consideration is a long-range matter. I like it for several reasons. First, it does use an existing program operated by an existing agency, the HHFA. Second, it does not call for grants to communities, it places assistance upon the basis of loans, which are repayable with interest. It could have, possibly, an effect upon the debt limit, but I assume that that matter would be adjusted to the needs and to the fund. I know of some communities in my State, such as Newport, Covington, Bellevue, and other cities, which wish to make sewage improvements. Some cannot do so, because the fund at the present time is limited to, I believe, cities of 5,000 or 10,000 population.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is 5,000, I think, under administrative ruling.

Mr. COOPER. That is an illogical limit, it seems to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That has been the administrative practice. The law provides for 10,000, but it has been kept to 5,000, under the conditions which have existed.

Mr. COOPER. There are improvements like sewage facilities which affect the health of the community. There are other improvements, as streets, that are necessary. I assume when the bill comes out of committee there will be a provision in it with respect to the size of the community. I believe that some of the larger cities, can take care of their needs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to observe at this point that some of the larger cities have credit ratings which enable them to get money slightly cheaper than the bill would provide.

Mr. COOPER. I close by saying that I would not at this time support a public-works bill such as I have been reading about, based upon a WPA pattern, or one which makes full grants to cities.

As I understand the proposal, it is based upon the use of an existing agency, the HHFA, which would make loans to communities. If the committee placed some limits upon the size of the community in which the funds could be available, or some means of taking into account the taxing resources of the city, and its ability to finance improvements, it would be a good bill.

I can see that it might have inflationary tendencies, and that would be the possibility of exceeding the debt limit. But if managed properly the benefits could far exceed these possibilities.

There is another reason why the bill interests me. Ever since I have been in the Senate on various occasions I have been a sponsor, or a cosponsor, of education bills. A few weeks ago much was said in the Senate about the defense of the Nation. Not much has been heard about it lately. As an element of defense, we were concerned about education in the Nation. We know the problems which make it difficult to secure passage of school-construction bills. I favor Federal-aid programs for school construction and teachers, a program which over the next 10 years would improve the educational facilities of the Nation so that they might meet the needs of the country. But we know the difficulties which are involved in getting this legislation passed.

The bill would provide a method by which towns and communities themselves could borrow money and construct such facilities.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall listen with an open mind in the hearings. At the moment, I am not too certain that I favor the bill as it is written. I shall offer an amendment to the bill or a substitute if it is proposed to do what the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and other Senators suggest should be done concerning Government guaranties of private loans, as the Government now guarantees FHA loans. My amendment would require that the interest rate be the prevailing interest rate, rather than to subsidize the different agencies which are piling up, day by day, through various proposals, literally billions and billions of dollars of debt, which, if the money should be spent, would cause the debt to go through the ceiling.

I do not think anyone is giving any thought to the solvency of the Nation. If it is necessary to do what is being talked about, I think it ought to be done on the basis of the prevailing interest rate, with the Government doing nothing more or less than guaranteeing the payment, as it does for FHA loans. The communities and cities which use the service should pay a fee, just as do the home builders of America. Let the Federal Government guarantee or insure the loans.

Mr. President, I serve notice that I shall offer such an amendment as a substitute for this kind of bill. I do not think the Nation can afford to be thrown further into debt. I do not see any reason in the world why, if this is a good, sound project—and there are many such—the regular, prevailing interest rate should not be paid. Why permit one city to get the benefit of a very low interest rate, while its neighbor, perhaps 10 or 20 miles away, is financing projects by itself and paying the going rate of interest?

I serve warning that I shall offer a substitute to the bill on that basis, if it seems to me that it is needed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] yielded to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding was that the Senator from Arkansas had the floor. Did he yield it? I wanted him to yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas yielded to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yielded under a unanimous-consent agreement that the Senator from Kentucky might speak briefly without my losing the floor.

Mr. COOPER. I had asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas might yield to me for a few minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I rise to the point of order that the Senator from Arkansas has no right to yield the floor for any purpose whatsoever, except to sit down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Last week the subject of unemployment insurance was discussed at length. I said then that the fund contained about \$8 billion.

On last November 30, the unemployment reserve fund was \$9,190,000,000. From December 1, 1957, through February 28, 1958, which was 90 days, or 3 months, \$553 million was expended from the funds by all 48 States of the Union and Alaska, leaving in the fund \$8,600,000,000.

I hope the press will circulate those figures widely, because that information ought to give confidence to the people who are unemployed and all the other people of the Nation that the unemployment-insurance reserve fund at the moment, which is the fund from which the States can call upon the Federal Government for assistance, was \$8,600,000,000 as of March 1.

I call attention to the fact that, despite the recession, only \$553 million of the \$9,190,000,000 was used during the past 90 days, or the 90 days prior to March 1. That is a little more than 6 percent in 3 months.

This means that if unemployment-insurance benefits are continued on that basis for the next 12 months, the amount used would be a little more than \$2 billion from the reserve fund which on November 30, 1957, contained more than \$9 billion.

That, I think, should be good news to the people. It is good news to the people. I think the time has arrived when Senators, Representatives, and reliable public officials should start to tell the people of the United States about the soundness of this reserve fund.

I think the soundness of the economy can be demonstrated by, for example, the news that retail sales in Washington last month were up 7 percent over a year ago. We ourselves ought to show some confidence in the strength of the economy. I liked the statement which the majority leader made this morning, when he said that he was more optimistic than he has been in a long while.

I do not mean to say that the things which Congress and the President have been doing are not good. I think they are. I think that accelerated public spending for certain projects is very much worthwhile, especially for projects for which it was intended to spend the money anyway. I simply say that the time has arrived when, in my opinion, we ought to stand still for a little while on these things, in order to show some confidence and faith in the economy, because the economy is sound.

Just as a man can be talked into being sick, so a nation can be talked into a depression. Let me quote what Mr. Truman said during the 1949-50 depression:

A certain amount of unemployment, say, from three to five million, is supportable. It is a good thing that jobseeking should go on

at all times. This is healthy for the economic body.

That was on February 15, 1950.

In January 1950, 5,063,000 Americans were out of employment. At the end of February of this year, approximately 5,100,000 Americans were out of employment—for all practical purposes, exactly the same number as the number unemployed in January 1950, when President Truman said that although that was not a healthy situation, the Nation could stand anywhere from 3 million to 5 million unemployed.

Personally, I wish not one person was unemployed. However, my point is that, in my opinion, Senators may be talking the country into a recession.

I am not receiving from Indiana any letters on this subject. The people from Indiana are not writing to me to request that Congress do many unsound things.

I believe Congress should begin to be optimistic, and should call attention to the good things, and should help instill confidence.

At the same time, let us do the necessary things. But let us not overdo them—which is what I believe the Congress is doing now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I never thought I would live to see the day when the Senator from Indiana would quote something President Truman said in 1950, in order to paint a rosy picture of the economy at this time.

I believe the country is in a recession. Certainly I do not rely on the figures circulated in Washington, D. C. I think too many Members of Congress have their noses buried in the District of Columbia.

In the State of Montana—from which I am receiving a great deal of mail on this subject—a depression exists, because, as I tried to point out earlier today, 63 percent of the miners who were employed a year ago in the Butte mining camp are out of work now, and 75 percent of the trades people and members of the crafts who work in and around the mines there are now out of work.

In Montana as of February 22, 14.9 percent were drawing unemployment compensation benefits; and that figure does not include those whose relief payments have run out or those who work for themselves or those who work on a part-time basis.

I wish to say to the Senator from Indiana that it is time for this administration and the Congress to wake up, because, although some might call the present condition a recession, unless something is done in the next several months, believe me, it is going to be a depression.

Let me call the attention of the Senator from Indiana to a particular aspect of the matter, which seems to have escaped the notice of the administration, the people, and the Congress, together: One of the things Mr. Stalin said at the end of the Second World War was that he was looking forward to the inevitable depression which was going to occur in the capitalistic United States; and that

when that day came, he felt that his ideology would "make hay."

That is the danger. As one who went through the depression of the 1930's, I never want to see those days return. If they do, this country will pay a terrible price.

So I say it is time for the Congress and the administration, together, not to issue "chins up, eyes front" statements, but to begin to take action, and to see to it that the American people are given, not charity, but jobs.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to state that the Senator from Montana is 100 percent correct; but we should do it by removing the roadblocks which hinder private industry. We ought not throw more roadblocks in the way of private industry. We should permit private industry to do the job. To do it the way too many people are suggesting today would be to do it in Mr. Stalin's way, which was for the Government to own everything—of course, in Russia the government owns everything—and for the government to handle all these matters, and for the government to provide employment. As we know, in Russia everyone works for the government. Many of the suggestions we have heard of late would have the United States duplicate the socialistic system. We must be very careful, as a result of all such suggestions, we do not permit that to happen.

Mr. President, I have not heard anyone suggest that the Congress take steps to help private industry put more Americans back to work. All the suggestions I have heard around here have been on the basis of taxing the American people and having the Federal Government spend the money.

I am willing to have Congress do things that will permit private industry to increase its employment. Either the United States will have a society and a Federal Government in which the Government owns everything and does everything and spends all the money; or the United States will have a free, private-enterprise system.

Let us do things that will take the shackles off business. Let us permit private industry to do the necessary things.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a correction?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Last week, did not the Senator from Indiana vote to have the excise taxes on automobiles and other manufactured products reduced—which, in turn, would have helped private industry?

Mr. CAPEHART. Certainly I did not vote for that amendment. However, I shall vote for that proposal when it is brought forward as a separate bill. But I refused to vote for it as an amendment to the bill which was before the Senate last week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Last week the Senator from Texas and others of us advocated giving that help to private industry. Why did not the Senator from Indiana vote for that amendment?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senators who advocated the adoption of that amendment were not fooling anyone; we know

that the proper way to handle that matter is to introduce such a bill and have it considered by the appropriate committee and reported to the Senate. The Senators who advocated the adoption of that amendment last week were not fooling me or anyone else about that move.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope we were not fooling the automobile manufacturers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I make no apologies for being fearful that Members of Congress and other high officials may talk the country into a recession. I make no apologies for being fearful that the Government may spend billions and billions of dollars in an effort to create jobs—made jobs—when it would be better to consider how to take the shackles off private industry and permit private industry to provide the needed jobs.

However, Mr. President, the Congress is fast moving down the road in the direction of having the Government do all these things. I have not added up the cost of all the proposals which have been made of late in the Congress, but certainly they will run into the billions and billions and billions of dollars.

That is why I said a moment ago that when the bill of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] comes from the Banking and Currency Committee I shall offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I do not particularly like the idea of having the Government guarantee private-enterprise loans, but I shall offer a substitute to the effect that the Federal Government shall guarantee or insure the loans in the way it is done under the FHA.

So, Mr. President, Senators had better stop, look, and listen before too many roadblocks are thrown in the way of private industry.

I believe it will be just as easy for all of us to devote our thoughts and our attention to figuring out ways and means to help private industry put the unemployed back to work; that will be just as easy for the Congress as it would be to figure out ways and means to spend the taxpayers' money in order to have the Government provide employment.

I say reservedly, and with apologies, that little intelligence is required to introduce a bill providing that the American people be taxed \$2 billion in order to do this, that, or the other thing. But intelligence and ingenuity are required to draw up a bill to help the private-enterprise system in the Nation do the necessary job. However, as I have said, little intelligence or ingenuity is required to propose the spending of \$2 billion, \$4 billion, \$6 billion, \$8 billion, \$10 billion, or \$12 billion. Anyone can work out such a bill.

Mr. President, the Members of Congress should get together and should figure out the ways and means to do the job, if it needs to be done; and I am the first to say that it will need to be done if the depression or recession gets any deeper.

But my best judgment is that we have checked the recession. In that connection, I give the Congress—including every Member of the Congress—much

credit, and I also give the President much credit, for taking certain actions.

But I say the time has come when we should stop talking about it, and should permit some of the things the President has suggested, or some of the things the Congress has suggested to the President, to take effect. Certainly there has not yet been time for them to take effect.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I believe I have concluded what I wish to say at this time. On tomorrow, I shall have more to say.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It has been interesting to listen to the Senator from Indiana. I do not see how we can talk ourselves into prosperity any more than we can talk ourselves out of a depression. I desire to point out that, in addition to my own State's having 14.9 percent of its employable workers on unemployment compensation, in the State of Idaho—this was true on February 22—the figure is 12.4 percent. In the State of Kentucky it is 12.3 percent. In the State of Oregon it is 12.3 percent. In the State of Michigan it is 12.2 percent. In the State of the present Presiding Officer [Mr. HOBLITZELL], West Virginia, it is 12.2 percent. In North Dakota, it is 11.7 percent. The national average is 7.9 percent. Those figures do not include persons partially employed or self-employed.

I do not know what the Senator from Indiana means when he says the Government should not do this, that, or the other thing, because, is it not true, insofar as the highway program is concerned, it is private industry that builds the roads and gets the contracts?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as housing is concerned, private industry builds the houses and gets the contracts. I think the facts should be laid on the table. We had better face the facts as of now, and not be going back to the days of McKinley, or even Truman.

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. MONRONEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana, or to any other Senator, with the understanding that by so doing I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. The figures the Senator from Montana gave us refer to those drawing unemployment insurance.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are literally millions of people who do not draw unemployment compensation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And some who are not working do not draw unemployment compensation.

Mr. CAPEHART. And some who are not working do not draw unemployment compensation. I know that as well as the Senator from Montana does. I am not unmindful of that fact. I again want to say I make no apologies for trying to solve this problem in the private enterprise way, and not trying to solve the problem in what I consider to be the socialistic way of taxing and taxing the American people and putting people to work through that method. We may have to do it; I do not know; but I am going to be against it as long as I can be. I want to try to do it through the private enterprise route, by finding ways and means of helping private enterprise put people back to work, and not by putting that burden on the Federal Government.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I had obtained the floor for the purpose of engaging in a brief colloquy with my friend from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], whose bill I have cosponsored. I shall not take more than 2 or 3 minutes, and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am also a cosponsor of the bill, and am very enthusiastic about making available for smaller cities, financing within 50 percent of what the larger cities enjoy in the big market, and seeing that the smaller cities enjoy the kind of cheaper financing which the bill provides.

Mr. CLARK. I could mention to the Senator 12 or 15 cities in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania which are in that category.

Mr. President, I was happy to cosponsor the bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas. I particularly desire to commend him for the fact that he has undertaken to fix interest rates for loans to help finance the construction of facilities at a rate identical to that applying in the college-housing loan program, which he sponsored, and which has been in effect with such great help to our educational institutions.

I find myself regrettably in complete disagreement with my friend from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] in his thinking that we ought to have high interest rates and a private market for loans in this kind of public works program, which definitely has behind it an antirecession purpose.

I am also happy that the Senator from Arkansas has undertaken to include public schools among the public facilities which can be financed with the loans. So I am happy to cosponsor the bill.

However, I say, in all candor to my good friend from Arkansas that, in my judgment, highly desirable though the bill is, it is not really going to have any helpful effect in the many depressed areas throughout the country, where unemployment is critical and has existed since long before the present recession occurred. As he knows, there are now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, of which he is the distinguished chairman, bills offered by the administration, and a bill offered by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who is now present on the floor,

and a bill offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], of which I and other Senators are cosponsors. I do not know whether the name of the Senator from Oklahoma is on the bill, but I believe he is in sympathy with the principle involved therein. I hope we shall be able to have prompt action on one or more of those bills at the earliest possible time, because my people in Pennsylvania—and this is true in many other States where critically depressed conditions have continued for many years—are crying for action and need action now.

The chairman of the committee and I are in disagreement with respect to the political philosophy involved in the depressed areas bill; but I wanted to make it clear, that in cosponsoring his bill, which I endorse completely, I am not yielding the feeling I entertain that we must have area redevelopment legislation in this session of Congress, and the quicker we can get it, the quicker we shall put people back to work. I hope my good friend is going to give some of the rest of us on the committee time to convince him that our views have some merit.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was the Senator asking me a question, or was he giving me a lecture? It was not clear.

Mr. CLARK. I would certainly never willingly attempt to lecture the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield for—

Mr. CLARK. In a second. I want the RECORD to be very clear that nothing is farther from my mind than an attempt to lecture the Senator from Arkansas, who knows so much more than I do about the subject. I would never want to be in the position even of seemingly attempting to lecture him. I was referring to an opportunity to have a hearing on the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood the Senator to say he wanted me to wait for a question. I do not know whether he has asked a question.

Mr. CLARK. The question is, Can we have a hearing on the depressed-areas bills?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows the bill to which he has made reference, and the other bills on the subject, are before the subcommittee and have not been reported to the full committee. I presume the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is a sponsor of that type of bill, is eager to have hearings. I further should like to point out that the recession, or the so-called depression, that has occurred in some of the coal towns, particularly in Pennsylvania, has now spread to the whole United States. The bill which we are discussing, and others, propose to meet the problem, I think, on a national basis, and not upon a single-community basis.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield so I may ask a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the bill is a cure-all for conditions in communities whose economy is based on natural resources or some other peculiar asset or resource. The bill does not offer to be a cure-all for all the ills of the

Nation, in all its diversities; and no other bill will be, in my opinion. So far as hearings are concerned, I think the subcommittee is ready, willing, and able to hold hearings. It has not reported to the full committee. When it does, I think the full committee will consider the bills.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say it is my understanding the subcommittee has completed hearings.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It has not reported the bill.

Mr. CLARK. It has not reported the bill, for reasons with which I think my friend is familiar. The fact of the matter is we have already created a precedent in our committee by bringing before the full committee the Sparkman housing bill. We are about to create a precedent by bringing before the full committee the bill introduced by its chairman [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I hope we may have an opportunity to bring before the full committee a depressed areas bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, the bills the Senator has referred to are extensions of policies already existing, the basic principles of which have been approved, and constitute existing law. It is not customary to take a new, highly controversial issue, and bypass the subcommittee.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Maine in a moment, but I wish to make another point first.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Especially when the chairman of the committee feels strongly about such a controversial issue. That is customary in the committee system.

Mr. CLARK. The chairman of the committee is entitled to his views, which I respect, even though I do not agree with them.

The chairman will recall that in 1956 the Senate passed a bill practically identical with that which is held up in the committee. Therefore, we are not discussing a new measure.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the Senator is fair in holding the previous action against me, because the Senator knows that under great pressure, and very reluctantly, in order to be sort of friendly to certain colleagues, I finally agreed to the bill at that time. For that matter to be brought up against me now will only make it difficult to be agreeable in the future as to some of these highly controversial measures.

Mr. CLARK. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas will always remain friendly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was not in favor of the bill then; at least I was not very strongly in favor of it. Today the recession or depression is nationwide, and it ought to be met on a nationwide basis, not upon a particularized basis pertaining to a few special cases.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am sure the chairman's sunny disposition and friendly attitude toward all his colleagues will continue, and we shall

shortly have a day set aside for hearings on these bills.

May I point out what has happened? Over a layer of an existing depression in Maine, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere, which lasted a long while, there has been superimposed another layer, creating a bad current recession.

The bill of my good friend from Arkansas, which I was happy to cosponsor, will take care of only the second layer, not the first.

Mr. President, I shall now be glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before the Senator from Pennsylvania yields, may I ask him to ask the Senator from Illinois to report the bill?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Maine, who wishes to address himself to the Senator from Arkansas, and I ask unanimous consent that I may so yield without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to inquire of my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas, who is the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, with relation to a couple of matters.

The indication was just given in a statement, unless I misunderstood the effect of it, that the proposed legislation had come before the subcommittee, but had not been reported, and, therefore, as I understood the implication, was a proposal of a type which probably should not be considered at this time. Is that inference correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I wish to say is that the proposal before the subcommittee is not an expansion of an existing program, such as the housing bill was. That distinguishes the proposed legislation from the treatment given the housing bill. The subcommittee should pass upon the matter. When the subcommittee passes upon it and refers it to the full committee we shall certainly take it up, in due time.

I suggest that the Senator address his pleas to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator from Maine, I assume, understood the chairman of the committee correctly as to the matter.

I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania pointed out a moment ago that a bill very similar to the one which is before the subcommittee for consideration was reported by the subcommittee, was reported by the full committee, and was passed by the Senate 3 years ago.

Recently I addressed a letter to the very amiable chairman of the committee with reference to the legislation we are discussing at present, which would have an effect upon the areas which have had their economies dislocated because of certain economic conditions which simply will not be corrected by the type of work being proposed in the bill the Senator from Arkansas has introduced. There has been a complete change in the

complexity of the situation in certain given areas.

Let me simply state that in my letter to the Senator I requested that a hearing be scheduled before the full committee. I requested a hearing before the full committee on the administration bill, on the bill introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and on the bill I introduced.

What was the reply? The reply was to the effect that it could not be done, because the committee was busily occupied with numerous other measures, and examples were cited. I wish I had a copy of the letter with me. There was cited, however, date after date after date after date when it was going to be impossible for the full committee to give consideration to the proposed legislation, notwithstanding the fact that the many people who are idle in these communities are not going to be helped too much, as the Senator from Pennsylvania has stated—which is true—by the legislation now being proposed.

My question is, How does it happen that all of a sudden, after last week's correspondence, in which it was stated the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency could not hear the matter because the full committee was so rushed with hearings on other bills, today on the floor of the Senate we have introduced a piece of proposed legislation which was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and as to which notice was given, sir, that hearings will be held on Wednesday of this week before the full committee?

Finally I desire to say, before the Senator answers, that this will be very good news, I am sure, to the thousands of unemployed textile workers in the area of Saco and Biddeford, to those who are out of employment in Lewiston and Auburn, and other areas of the United States, to the coal miners and others in Pennsylvania, of whom the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has spoken, and to those for whom the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has been working. It will be wonderful news to them that proposed legislation which would help straighten out their situations, by revitalizing the economies of the areas and making a change in the whole approach, is lying dormant in the committee and has lain dormant there now for over a year—for nearly a year and 3 months—without a single bit of interest shown in it or action having been taken by the full committee. Despite that, the bill relating to housing was brought up—and I was in favor of it—and passed by the Senate within about 3 or 4 days, and now the Senator from Arkansas is proposing the identical system of maneuvering in connection with the bill he has today introduced. I am not sure that I am not in sympathy with the bill to a great degree, but not to the point where I shall be willing to lend my name to it now, since the other bill has been held up for more than 15 months.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield to my friend from Arkansas, and I ask unanimous consent that in so yielding I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, several observations could properly be made. As a matter of fact, the committee is very busy. The hearing for Wednesday had to be scheduled in the afternoon. The Senate will be in session.

The importance of this type of legislation, that is, the bill I have just introduced, in connection with the immediate problem of the recession has been recognized by many Senators and by the majority leader, who specifically requested that we fix a date for the hearing at the earliest possible time. I could not set aside the hearings which had been scheduled for this week on the bill in which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] is very much interested, and as to which plans have been made long in advance.

As I have said, the measure I have introduced relates to an expansion of an existing program. I think it is noncontroversial. Therefore, the bypassing of the subcommittee is in accord with the practice which we have followed with regard to housing, and the practice which we follow in many other similar instances.

That procedure has nothing in common with the proposed legislation in which the Senator is interested. That legislation which passed the Senate in 1956 was then reported by the Labor Committee. I think the Senator has pointed out and has indicated the nature of the difficulty. The Senator assumes by his statement that the Congress by enacting legislation can correct inherent basic difficulties which arise in a community where the character of the business of the people has changed. For example, the Senator has mentioned coal.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say a word, please.

I used to be interested in a company which made farm wagons. That company went out of business completely. There was not anything Congress could do about it. People simply do not use farm wagons anymore. I do not think any bill could have helped that situation.

If the coal industry is depressed, as it is, it is also certainly true that mostly it is depressed in the marginal areas. However, I notice from the reports that the Consolidated Coal Co. has reported the highest earnings in its history. The story is not all bad.

There are many of us who do not accept the principle the Senator from Maine thinks is self-evident, namely, that by waving a wand we can re-create the fundamental prosperity of every town in Maine which is suffering from a depression.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let me say that is not something which is self-evident, as the Senator assumes, whereas the measure which is being set for hearing

Wednesday afternoon relates to an existing program. It relates to something Congress has approved. It relates to a program in being. It has been a bipartisan matter.

A moment ago the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] made some remarks that confused me. At first he took credit for sponsoring the program. The next moment he was denouncing it as socialism. I was not sure where he stood.

In any case, Congress enacted the program. It is in being. So far I know of no one who has seriously questioned the basic validity of the idea which is involved, and which is proposed to be expanded by the legislation I have proposed. If there were great controversy, and the subject required thorough hearings, it would be referred to a subcommittee, as is the usual practice.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President—
Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I make this point only because at an earlier time the floor was lost because a technical point was raised. Ordinarily I would not make the point.

I ask unanimous consent that I may yield further to the Senator from Arkansas without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I had in mind one further point, because of the vigorous attack on the procedure by the Senator from Maine.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], was in favor of the procedure in the handling of the housing bill, as was the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. No one thought there was any need of hearings in the subcommittee. As I pointed out previously, bills similar to the Payne bill are before the subcommittee. Hearings have been held, and no report has been made to the full committee.

I do not think the Senator from Maine has any complaint.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Maine with the same understanding, that I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like to make one further observation. This is a brand-new approach to the problem. It is something to which the Congress has never given any consideration over the years. What is proposed by this legislation with respect to distressed areas and dislocations of the economy is a brand-new approach.

My good colleague the Senator from Arkansas is a very high-ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Does he want the RECORD to indicate to the American people, to the unemployed textile workers, to the unemployed in the coal industry, and in industries in other areas of our country that we have not had programs—some of which, I am sure

have been proposed by my colleague—of foreign aid based upon certain philosophies of technical assistance to various areas of the world, in an effort to help the people of other nations to rebuild their economies? Does the Senator wish to say that such programs have not been considered by the Congress?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator is suggesting that the groups he has in mind are illiterate and know nothing about modern techniques—

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator knows better than that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The present situation is not at all comparable with the point 4 programs.

Mr. PAYNE. What did we do when we went into some foreign countries which previously had industries, which were in such a condition as to be almost nonexistent? We built up a new economy for them. The money of the taxpayers of the United States was used for that purpose. I did not object to it. I supported that program. I am simply asking that our own people, whose economy has been dislocated by reason of certain policies, receive the same consideration which we are giving to other countries. The committee is not giving such consideration.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, let me say in conclusion that I believe the colloquy has demonstrated that there is strong bipartisan support for an area redevelopment bill. The distress in Maine, Pennsylvania, Montana, and other States and communities is not Republican distress. It is not Democratic distress. It is American distress. It has existed for a shameful length of time. It is a disgrace to our country that we have done nothing about it up to this time.

I hope with all my heart that arrangements can be made by which Members of this body, will have an opportunity, on a bipartisan basis, to express their views as to whether that shameful condition shall be brought to an end by effective aid from the Federal Government.

I honor my good friend from Arkansas. Perhaps I have spoken with more heat than I should have spoken. The Senator from Arkansas is sincere in his views. He is a man of great compassion, with an interest in the welfare of the unfortunate.

I hope with all my heart that an opportunity will be given to the Committee on Banking and Currency to vote on area distress legislation at the earliest possible moment, and that an appropriate bill may be reported to the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I desire to congratulate the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for his introduction of the community facilities bill of 1958. I am glad to be associated with him as a cosponsor of the bill. I think the bill is wise and sound and is urgently needed.

I favor passage of the bill, for two reasons:

First, it will make it possible immediately to commence local projects and, in doing so, to put people to work.

Second, it will keep interest rates low; and it also will keep down local taxes, which by and large are regressive.

RAMON MAGSAYSAY, AUGUST 31, 1907—MARCH 17, 1957

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, 1 year ago on this day, the life of one of the great patriots and leaders of this age was tragically crushed out against a mountainside far off in the Philippines.

Americans who knew him respected President Magsaysay as fully as did his own countrymen. Though 10,000 miles from this Chamber, the ideals and spirit of that man are as close to our hearts as if he were one of us. Indeed, the nobility of purpose of Ramon Magsaysay's life stands as an image for all men who cherish liberty and justice to emulate.

He rose from humble beginnings in Zambales Province, just north of historic Bataan, to become first a garage mechanic and later the manager of a local bus line. When the American Army requisitioned his trucks, he himself voluntarily went with them to the war. The fall of Bataan found him organizing a guerrilla force in the mountains of his native province. His forces were so successful during the dark days of the Japanese occupation that they were able to clear the enemy from the entire Zambales coast. The long-awaited return of American troops found Magsaysay leader of all the guerrilla forces in western Luzon under orders from General MacArthur.

After the war he was elected to the Congress of the Republic of the Philippines, where he worked tirelessly for the welfare of his fellow veterans of the war. Twice he visited Washington on missions in which he showed the honesty, strength of purpose, and the tremendous vitality with which he later won for his country victory over the Communist armed aggression that threatened to annihilate it.

In September 1950, he was appointed Secretary of National Defense. Seeing the growth of the Communist Huk movement in the face of inadequate resistance from an army weakened by corruption and war-weariness, he revamped and revitalized his department. He personally set the standard of honesty, efficiency, and concern for the people. His insistence that the Philippine Army live up to this standard inspired his troops with enthusiasm and won the campaign that destroyed a powerful, organized Communist guerrilla force of 10,000 armed men.

As a result of his inspiration, the Philippine people overwhelmingly chose him as their new President. Not satisfied with mere military defeat of communism, Magsaysay launched the second great campaign of his public life. In the interest of political stability and social progress, he personally waged an effective fight against corruption in government, the great despoiler of the Nation's wealth. To destroy the treacherous allure of communism to the ignorant and poverty stricken, he led in the building of a better life for his people. Resettlement programs, land reforms, agricultural credit facilities, barrio—village—road development, education, social security, and public health improvement were some of the blessings he brought to a people that had known chiefly pov-

erty and oppression aggravated by political corruption. His example of honesty and concern for the people was soon reflected in improved performance in every phase of Philippine Government activity.

In foreign relations he was just as courageous and imaginative in leading his nation to the signing of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty in Manila, and in encouraging every measure to check the infection of today's greatest threat to the world, communism.

The chief gift of his life unstintingly offered to his people was hope. Hope for more meaning to their struggles. Hope for a good life of freedom, dignity, and spiritual and material improvement.

His passing in the prime of life, before seeing the fulfillment of his great vision for his country, was a loss felt far beyond the Republic of the Philippines. In the words of our Secretary of State:

That loss falls also everywhere upon those who, having liberty, would preserve it; upon those who never having had liberty, would gain it; and upon those who having lost liberty, would regain it.

We who viewed from afar his life of sacrifice and danger can console ourselves with the knowledge that 100 years from March 17, 1957, no less than 1 year from that fateful day, the truly great spirit of Ramon Magsaysay will live on to inspire and motivate the struggles of free men against enslavement.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING OF REPORTS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the filing of reports by the Committee on the Judiciary, required by Senate resolutions, be extended to March 31, 1958. The resolutions referred to are Senate Resolutions 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, and 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETRIFIED FOREST NATIONAL PARK, ARIZ.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, earlier today, on the call of the Calendar, consideration of Calendar No. 1381, S. 2359, was deferred because the House bill had not come to the Senate. Since that time the House bill has been received. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2359.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2359) to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park in the State of Arizona and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House bill, H. R. 8250.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 8250) to authorize the establishment of the Petrified Forest National Park, in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 8250) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate having just passed H. R. 8250, S. 2359 will be indefinitely postponed.

UNITED NATIONS CONTROL OF OUTER SPACE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again the United States has been placed on the defensive in the cold war. Once again we find ourselves in a position where we must explain, and justify, and stammer.

This situation would be deplorable enough if it resulted from a weakness in our position. But it is even more tragic than that. The fact is that we led our weakest cards from a position of strength.

This morning's New York Times carries an article by a distinguished diplomatic correspondent, E. W. Kenworthy. The headline over this article is very revealing. It says: "United States Aides Concede Soviet Space Plan Is Propaganda Gain."

This article quotes our own officials as saying that the Soviet proposal for United Nations control of outer space "was a brilliantly conceived, executed, and timed propaganda stroke." And it is difficult to disagree in honesty with that estimate.

The fact that the Soviet proposal is merely a mask for unacceptable conditions will be little noticed by the world anxious for peace. The impact will be simply that the Soviet Union wishes to use outer space for peace while the United States hesitates and stands firm only on negative proposals.

Mr. President, there is no excuse for this situation. The potentialities of outer space for bringing peace to this world were first stated by the Senate majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, on January 14 of this year in a public statement. He said:

Further, it would be appropriate and fitting for our Nation to demonstrate its initiative before the United Nations by inviting all member nations to join in this venture into outer space together.

This statement struck a responsive chord in the breasts of people everywhere. On January 31, United Nations General Assembly President, Sir Leslie Munro, suggested a United Nations conference of scientists and diplomats to study control of outer space. He said, at the time, that the world was looking

for someone to bring the issue to the United Nations.

On February 3, the Senate majority leader once again spoke on this question—this time to the Senate. His words are well worth recalling and I wish to quote a few paragraphs from his statement:

There is no point in deluding ourselves that we can just call off the arms race on our own initiative. There is no point in debating why they do not call off the arms race at their own initiative.

The only worthwhile discussion is what is said in the effort to find ways and means of breaking the logjam—of bringing the tragedy of the cold war to an end.

This is the time to act—now, while the satellites are searching for facts instead of for targets.

I would hope that our leaders would give urgent consideration to a proposal for joint exploration of outer space by the United Nations. I would hope that this proposal could be pressed earnestly, vigorously and with all the sincerity at our command.

No one would stand to lose by this proposal. The alternative is a disorderly arms race which can end only in death and destruction.

Mr. President, had those words been heeded at that time, we would not find ourselves in our present predicament. We would be standing before the world in our true garb—that of the nation which desires peace and which is willing to take the necessary steps.

Instead, we have blundered into the world of George Orwell in which the aggressor carries the banner of the peacemaker, and the peacemaker is forced to carry the banner of the aggressor. And it would be a great mistake to underestimate the impact of such propaganda on the uncommitted portions of the world.

Mr. President, no one of us carries a crystal ball which actively predicts the future. We can only hope that the historians who describe that future after it has happened will not describe this particular chapter of American history as the age of timidity and defeat.

A proposal was advanced by the Senate majority leader. The President's special adviser on disarmament endorsed it. The Senate minority leader said he thought outer space should be handled by the United Nations.

The distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] lent his full support to the proposal, as did the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If I recall correctly, the Secretary of State, while he took no action on the proposal, thought it could be used as a step in the right direction.

At least, the Secretary of State said the idea was under consideration. Then the Soviet Union picked up the ball and ran with it dangerously close to a touchdown.

Mr. President, the stakes are enormous. They include the future of our Nation. They also include the concept of freedom as a social system whereby the affairs of mankind can be conducted.

We cannot forever depend upon a merciful God to save a people whose leadership handles so lightly the responsibilities which have been entrusted to it.

The responsibility here is plain. Congress can propose and Congress can authorize. But only the executive branch can conduct the foreign policy of this Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the article written by Mr. Kenworthy, of the New York Times; the statement made by the Senate majority leader on February 3; the speech made by the Senate majority leader before the Columbia Broadcasting System affiliates in Washington on January 14, 1958; and certain other excerpts.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 17, 1958]

UNITED STATES AIDES CONCEDE SOVIET SPACE PLAN IS PROPAGANDA GAIN (By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, March 16.—The Soviet Union's proposal for control of outer space was a brilliantly conceived, executed and timed propaganda stroke, in the view of some officials here.

In a statement issued yesterday, the Soviet Foreign Ministry proposed a United Nations agency to police a ban on outer space missiles and administer a program for the peaceful use of space.

The plan was conditioned on the removal of United States overseas military bases, first and foremost in Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa.

IMPACT IN NATO ENVISAGED

After reading the text of the statement, some officials here felt that Moscow might have scored a coup that could have considerable impact not only in neutral nations but also in some North Atlantic Treaty countries.

These officials said the condition that made the Soviet proposal so obviously unacceptable to the United States might appear reasonable to many persons in these countries if they accepted Moscow's plausible justification for it.

As the Soviet plan for a United Nations body to supervise peaceful space research, the consensus of many officials here was, we got scooped.

These are the points made by officials today in conceding that the Soviet plan was a shrewd propaganda move:

First, they note that the Soviet plan was prefaced by a long passage impugning the motives behind President Eisenhower's peaceful space proposal in his letter to Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin of January 12.

The Soviet statement said:

"In making this proposal, President Eisenhower singled out from the general disarmament problem the question of intercontinental ballistic missiles. . . . He proposes, in fact, to ban intercontinental ballistic missiles only. . . . It is noteworthy that, while proposing a ban on the intercontinental ballistic missile, the United States builds its military plans on the use of atom and hydrogen bombs as warheads in the short and medium-range rockets which they already possess."

In short, the Soviet statement says, the United States is trying to ban the weapon "which could be used against objectives on the territory of the United States," while insisting on retaining the bases from which it can reach the Soviet Union with nuclear-armed intermediate-range missiles and strategic bombers.

Officials note that there is a large distortion here. In his letter to Premier Bulganin, the President did not single out intercontinental ballistic missiles, or even mention them.

General Eisenhower called for an agreement banning all weapons using outer space, which would include both ICBM's and IRBM's. Actually, officials here comment, studies on the implementation of the President's proposal specifically mention a ban on the testing and use of both types of missiles.

These officials also note that the Soviet argument can be turned around. The Soviet Union holds captive all of Eastern Europe except Yugoslavia, refusing to permit free elections. Its ground forces far outnumber those of the NATO alliance. The great allied deterrent to extension of Soviet power is the United States Strategic Air Force.

If the United States is to dismantle its overseas air bases, then, these officials maintain, the Soviet Union should agree to free its satellites, reduce its land forces and withdraw them within the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, these officials concede the skillfulness with which the Soviet Union is using the argument that they want us to pick up our slingshots but they won't give up their club.

Second, those officials concede that Moscow got the jump on us by suggesting a United Nations agency. They say, somewhat ruefully, that the administration has not followed up the initiative gained by the President's proposal to Premier Bulganin.

Oddly enough, they recall, studies undertaken here immediately after the President's letter suggested that, as soon as the United States successfully launched its first satellite, the President should make a statement urging a United Nations program for the peaceful use of outer space and declaring United States intentions to introduce a resolution to that effect in the next session of the General Assembly.

These officials also note that the same studies made general recommendations parallel with those advanced by the Soviet Union, a missile ban, control and inspection by a United Nations body and coordination of national research programs on peaceful use of space by the United Nations.

SOVIET TEXT CORRECTION

LONDON, March 16.—The text of a statement issued by the Soviet Foreign Ministry yesterday as issued by the Soviet news agency Tass and transmitted by Reuters, omitted through a transmission error a phrase that altered the sense of one sentence.

The sentence in question read: "Why is it then that the American proposals suggest the outlawing of intercontinental ballistic rockets which could be used against objectives on the territory of the United States of America, while evading the question of eliminating American military bases on foreign territories intended to launch rockets possessed by the United States Armed Forces and for the use of American bombers?"

The corrected sentence should read: "Why is it then that the American proposals suggest the outlawing of intercontinental ballistic rockets, which in the case of a retaliatory blow, and only in that case, could be used against objectives, etc."

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AMERICAN SATELLITE EXPLORER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Friday, some very anxious moments for our people came to an end. An American satellite was put into orbit and at this moment is circling the globe.

The Explorer is a triumph of persistence against great odds. It represents the dedicated work of men like General Medaris, Wernher von Braun, and numberless scientists and technicians who will never receive their fair share of credit.

Our satellite is very aptly named. It is truly an explorer—a representative of the

free people searching for the facts of a totally new dimension into which men and women will soon step. And, in its search for facts, it brings us face to face with a sharp reality which we cannot ignore.

Neither the Explorer nor its Soviet predecessors can be considered military weapons. They are merely collectors of data which they are transmitting or have transmitted back to earthbound men.

But the facts and figures of the physical world are of a peculiar nature. They have no loyalty, no patriotism, no system of morality and ethics. They are available for the advancement of mankind, or for the destruction of mankind.

The science of biology has given us penicillin and germ warfare. The science of chemistry has given us medicine and poison gas. The science of physics has given us new sources of useful power and the hydrogen bomb.

Now a new science—astronautics—is moving rapidly from the drawing board to the workshop. Will it give us new frontiers or new forms of total devastation?

To continue the arms race at this time will inevitably bring us to the point of no return. There must be action now—now, while there is still time to bring the new forces under control.

It is not difficult to forecast the future if the present situation continues. This will be the world of the manic depressive—high points of elation when "we" make an important advance; low points of despair when "they" outstrip us.

And at some interval when "we" are at a low point and "they" are at a high point, somebody is going to press the button.

There is no point in deluding ourselves that "we" can just call off the arms race on our own initiative. There is no point in debating why they do not call off the arms race at their own initiative.

The only worthwhile discussion is what is said in the effort to find ways and means of breaking the logjam—of bringing the tragedy of the cold war to an end.

This is the time to act—now, while the satellites are searching for facts instead of for targets.

I would hope that our leaders would give urgent consideration to a proposal for joint exploration of outer space by the United Nations. I would hope that this proposal could be pressed earnestly, vigorously, and with all the sincerity at our command.

No one would stand to lose by this proposal. The alternative is a disorderly arms race which can end only in death and destruction.

For the moment, our prestige is at a high point. There is no better time for a display of the generosity, the initiative and the constructive desire for peace which lies in the soul of the American people.

The president of the United Nations General Assembly—Sir Leslie Munro—has spoken the desires of the world. He says the nations are looking for leadership in the drive into outer space.

We have heard this morning that our President has received another letter from Soviet Premier Bulganin. It rejects the idea of a foreign ministers' conference as a precondition to a summit conference.

Whatever the note may say, however, there has never before been a more golden opportunity to bring this war-weary world to peace. A strong and determined proposal to cooperate now may save all of us from a strong and determined—and probably successful—effort to destroy humanity later.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a United Press dispatch from the United Nations headed "U. N. Talks Urged on Outer Space."

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"U. N. TALKS URGED ON OUTER SPACE"

"UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., January 31.—General Assembly President Sir Leslie Munro, of New Zealand, tonight suggested a U. N. conference of scientists and diplomats within the next 2 or 3 months to study control of outer space.

"Munro, who has spoken several times of the need to get United Nations action started to deal with the age of space, made the suggestion in a broadcast interview recorded for U. N. radio.

"Munro said that despite many references by President Eisenhower and others to the need for space control, there has been no initiative except in embryo to bring the issue to the U. N."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS, BEFORE A MEETING OF CBS AFFILIATES, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 14, 1958

I am here today to speak to a group which has a grave responsibility for informing our people.

In the Chamber of the Senate of the United States, I am the designated leader of the majority party. That is a title of which I am proud but one which carries with it responsibilities that would cause any man to be humble. But it is a designation which, for this occasion, I have left behind.

I am not here as a Democrat.

I am not here as a leader of the Senate.

I am here as an American.

In this town, we have the habit of dividing all things by lines of affiliation: the offices, the jobs, the various positions, and sometimes even our judgments.

At this hour in our history, I, for one, believe that there are certain facts which cannot be divided along such lines and certain judgments we must reach and decisions we must make together, as Americans, and as Americans only.

Even as we sit here at these tables there orbits in the sky above us—around and around this earth—the most compelling fact of our times.

The Sputniks out in space have only one meaning.

There is no Democratic meaning.

There is no Republican meaning.

There is, in truth, no narrow American meaning.

In all history, mankind has never faced so great a challenge—or so great an opportunity. If outer space is allowed to become the province of the earth's imperialists, then the freedom we have fashioned at so high a price shall fall into eternal jeopardy.

If, however, free men set their sails for this new world as our forebears did when this continent was opened, then we have the opportunity of adding a new dimension to freedom—and, with it, the very real prospect of reaching our goal of total peace.

These are exciting thoughts, exciting goals.

We would be out of character with our American heritage if we were not stirred by what we can now see on ahead in this new age.

We would be even more out of character—both as Americans and as free men—if we should lose this hour of opportunity in preoccupation with partisan thoughts of who is to receive the credit and who is to receive the blame.

Facts are not partisan, and the facts are these:

For a decade now, the Free World—led by the United States—has summoned up its resources and resourcefulness to contain the most powerful and most ruthless aggressor ever to appear among the governments of the earth.

The physical containment has, in large part, succeeded.

It has succeeded, I should say, until now.

Today no responsible man can say or would say continued success of our past policies is assured.

There is now abundant evidence that a pattern of history is repeating. We, like the dynasties of ancient China on down to the Republic of France, have built a wall against aggression, but now we find that we are the imprisoned.

The Soviet has, dramatically, leaped over our wall.

More importantly, we are awakened to the reality that advances of Soviet technology and science have made our wall of security a relic of another age.

Let me cite for you certain specifics, certain facts which all of us, as Americans, must sit down and consider together.

These are not facts of my invention. These are facts testified to by our military leadership coming before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

First. The Soviet has under arms nearly as many divisions as do all the free nations combined.

Second. The Soviet air strength is probably close to that of our own.

Third. The Soviet submarine armada now numbers 500, while ours totals only 110.

Fourth. The Soviet shipyards are building 100 new submarines annually, while we are building fewer than ten.

Fifth. The Soviet capacity to launch a one-half ton satellite into space indicates the capacity on their part to launch long-range ballistic missiles against our cities from Soviet soil.

Sixth. The Soviet has now the capacity to launch, from land bases or from its submarines, shorter range missiles against our installations at home and overseas.

These are military facts. They are important. I would mislead you if I did not say that there are more, more which in time I believe should become public knowledge. What is the sum of these facts?

The facts of comparative strength between the two strong powers do not add up to disaster—but they do, clearly, total up to peril.

For the moment, the stalemate is not clearly broken. The Soviet striking power is great and growing greater, but our retaliatory power is great, also. This the Soviet knows, as we know.

The Soviet however, also knows—as we must come to know—that the rate of growth of their striking power far exceeds ours.

We are behind but we are not yet hopelessly behind. Our peril becomes a disaster when we fall so far behind that there is no hope of recovery. It is to the prevention of that disaster all free men must now dedicate their efforts.

How is such disaster to be prevented?

Some, looking back to the past, will answer only that the Nation must retool its productive capacity, get ready for a massive effort, and move forward to match the Soviet sputnik for sputnik, missile for missile, sub for sub.

If war were inevitable, I would join in such a call.

But no man who looks beyond the moment will suggest that war is the inevitable consequence of mankind's new adventure into space. I, myself, am confident that it is not.

Space may well be the sea in which the human race will some day find an island of peace.

To reach that island, we need more than weapons.

We need, in fact, to free ourselves of the bonds of a weapon psychology.

Our greatest need in this hour is to unleash the pioneering spirit and the daring and brilliance of our people and set this Nation's course on the pursuit of peace.

We cannot, of course, ignore the need for weapons now.

We need a faster rate of production for our missiles, far faster than any yet permitted or any yet envisioned.

As Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons on June 18, 1940:

"If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future."

I say that such must be our creed at this hour.

It is with that creed before us that we must proceed, as responsible men, to assess the position of free men in the world today.

I see no gain in picking petty quarrels with the past.

I myself am willing to draw a line at the here and now, and measure responsibility in terms of what is done for the future rather than in terms of what was done in the past.

From this base, I believe we can take a more honest look at the problems we face.

What are those problems? Let me call them as I see them.

First and foremost, I believe that we are paying too high a price for conformity.

Ours has been, always, a Nation built by the greatness of men's hearts and spirits and minds. America's vigor has come from the originality, the freshness, the vision of our people—all our people, not merely an intellectual elite.

For a decade now, we have seen growing a climate of contempt for these values. We are paying a price for that.

Our investigating committee has found, in some most striking examples, that this has been at the heart of some of our preparedness difficulties.

The fight to build for this Nation an atomic submarine is a record of the persistence against great odds of one man, Admiral Rickover, who believed that it could be built. Because he was more determined to perform than to conform, this brilliant man was—on numerous occasions—shunted into obscurity and his services to the Nation were very nearly lost.

This past few days, in our committee room, I sat 2 feet away from a great Army general and watched him choke back the tears of deep emotion. He told us that his decision to retire from service was final. He said he could not speak freely and he could not support a policy which meant placing American troops in the range of enemy missiles without adequate weapons of defense.

Over and over again, I have heard—and our committee has heard—the leading military men of this Nation come before us and say that a conventional system has cut back on our programs for unconventional developments.

Over and over, we have heard them say that we are not, even yet, doing all that we could and should be doing to move forward in this hour of challenge.

This is not the road to strength.

This is not the road America should travel.

We must turn to the dedicated men of vision and welcome them into the councils of respect and dignity.

We must provide a climate in which the men and women of our universities, our research centers, our career services, our world of journalism and communications, can make a full contribution of their talents.

Let me make this point clear.

It is not true that the abilities of Soviet science far exceed those of our American scientists.

As free men, who respect the freedom of man's mind, we must not allow political policies to chain our most priceless resource.

As we face this problem of removing the fetters from our capacity, we must also remove the fetters of tradition from our policy.

Our defensive strategies, in a military sense, are undergoing reappraisal and reexamination.

It would be a mistake to stop there.

Our foreign policies require the same reappraisal.

So, also, do our domestic policies and values.

We have, for long, held a position of strength in world affairs. That position is no longer secure. We must not be so inflexible that we can imagine no changed policy to cope with a changed position.

Domestically, likewise, each of you as businessmen know that our economy is now undergoing a period of change. This change is not merely a cycle through which we are passing. There are new problems, new challenges arising to the very functioning of our system.

Channels of distribution are undergoing change.

Changes are evident in consumer demand and consumer taste.

Profoundly important population shifts are continuing.

We must not wait for calamity before undertaking a cure.

Just as we erred in our estimate of what Soviet gains might mean in the realm of technology, so can we err by complacency in our estimate of what domestic losses might mean in the realm of our economic health.

These things I mention only briefly, to emphasize that in this challenging period we need more, far more, than a purely military response to the Soviet challenge.

We need the marshaling of our resources, physical and mental, such as we have never had before.

We need imagination and freshness.

We need force and boldness in our leadership.

We need, further, I believe, to look beyond the danger evident now to see the horizons of peace in outer space.

I am no scientist and I do not pretend to be.

But the brilliant men of this age—the brilliant minds of America—tell us things that we cannot ignore.

Out in space, there is the power to control the earth's weather, to change the climate where we live, to alter the tides and direct the Gulf Stream on a different course.

From space, snapshots can be taken of your backyard.

The whole technology of communication can be changed.

It is a fascinating, daring, exciting world.

The frontier it opens for human advancement exceeds any man has ever faced.

Surely we cannot, as leaders of free men, ignore it.

Surely we cannot, with this opportunity before us, fail to see that this affords us the one clear course to recapture the initiative for freedom.

Here is an opportunity to bring men together in common cause as never before.

Here is an opportunity for us to sponsor the flourishing of mankind's genius.

Before this session of Congress ends, I am hopeful that we shall be able to establish in our Government a proper agency for direction of a new national effort in this realm.

I am hopeful, also, that we shall be able to provide a program for the enlargement of our research activities, making the laboratories and the equipment available to draw the best from the minds of our people.

I am hopeful that, furthermore, we shall be able to foster the strengthening of our total educational process, not to produce an army of technicians, but, rather, to pour forth legions of broadly-educated men and women.

As we do these things, I trust that in our relations with other nations we shall be imaginative, and that we shall make it evident that America's Free World leadership is not sterile.

We should, certainly, make provisions for inviting together the scientists of other nations to work in concert on projects to extend the frontiers of man and to find solutions to the troubles of this earth.

Our President, holding as he does the esteem of men throughout the world, has a rare opportunity to lead in this labor boldly and forcefully, and in the vigorous pursuit of peace he will find the Nation undivided in his support.

Further, it would be appropriate and fitting for our Nation to demonstrate its initiative before the United Nations by inviting all member nations to join in this adventure into outer space together.

The dimensions of space dwarf our national differences on earth.

If we are to win space as the outpost of peace, all men may—and should—share in that endeavor.

We, with our great resources and our great abilities, must not allow the leadership to slip from our grasp.

The world in which we live is a world in which danger abounds.

There is no greater danger, though, than for us to shrink from the responsibilities of the hour.

Ahead, if we move with speed, if we move with daring, we shall find fulfillment of our quest for peace.

If we are to reach such a goal, our response must begin now. This, more than we realize, is the year of decision, the year our course is set.

In such a year, we need be responsible men, loyal to our nation, faithful to freedom, strangers to partisanship, and friends with the imagination that has been so much a part of our heritage.

THE GOAL IS TOTAL PEACE—EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENTS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON

ADDRESS IN HOUSTON, TEX., DECEMBER 4, 1957

There is something much bigger and more important in front of us than a few pieces of military hardware. Ballistic missiles and the other fantastic weapons now on the drawing boards are not to be despised.

But they do not hold the key to the future. They are only a small part of the future—a part which will become obsolete almost as soon as it is developed.

What is really before us is something that should have a deep appeal to the American soul. It is a new frontier—a new age—that is exciting and challenging.

What we are doing is stepping into the age of space.

ADDRESS BEFORE MEETING OF DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE, JANUARY 7, 1958

Within the short weeks since October 4, man has become master of horizons far beyond our imagination. We must respect this mastery, and from that respect we must, more than ever, seek to bring all men together in cooperative effort. The goals now within reach of the human race are too great to be divided as spoils, too great for the world to waste its efforts in a blind race between competitive nations. The conference table is more important now than ever it has been, and we should welcome to its chairs all men of all nations.

ADDRESS BEFORE MEETING OF CBS AFFILIATES, JANUARY 14, 1958

Our greatest need in this hour is to unleash the pioneering spirit and the daring and brilliance of our people and set this Nation's course on the pursuit of peace.

It would be appropriate and fitting for our Nation to demonstrate its initiative before the United Nations by inviting all member nations to join in this adventure into outer space together.

ADDRESS ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE, JANUARY 27, 1958

I do, however, have a great deal of faith in efforts to outlaw war when they are accompanied by positive steps to bring people together in cooperation.

When people work together to face a great challenge, they tend to lose their suspicion of each other. They become absorbed in the task before them—and fighting as an instrument of policy fades from the picture.

It is for this reason that I believe the current situation affords us such a great opportunity. There are positive steps which we can take in concert with the other nations of the world to face the great challenge presented by outer space.

ADDRESS ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE, FEBRUARY 4, 1958

Our plans for peace must progress jointly and must be as firm as our plans for defense. In other words, this must be a joint effort.

We must not spend all our billions of dollars and make all our plans to fight a war which may never be fought. But in preparing our Nation and in purchasing the implements, the missiles, the planes, and the submarines which may be necessary to prevent a war, we should also have some positive, affirmative plan for peace, to go alongside our preparedness efforts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This development disturbs me very much. The headline, indicating that the Soviets are taking a suggestion which was made long ago—and I recall particularly the majority leader's statement early in the session about the control of space—and are now using the same ideas as great propaganda, confuses me very much.

I do not quite understand what was the attitude of the administration toward the suggestion by the majority leader. My attention was distracted a moment ago, and I did not hear what the Senator said about what occurred concerning the suggestion made by the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the \$64,000 question. The Secretary of State did not think it was a bad idea. The minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]; the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], all gave their approval to it. Mr. Stassen, the President's adviser on disarmament, likewise favored it.

Nothing was done. That is why I am taking the floor this afternoon. I was shocked to read the article by Mr. Kenworthy, according to which the administration admitted that the Soviet Union had performed a major propaganda achievement, had achieved a victory in the field of propaganda, even though the idea had originally been brought forth by the distinguished majority leader, even though several months had passed, during which the administration could have made use of the proposal, and even though the President of the United Nations General Assembly, Sir Leslie Munro, had advocated the idea and was waiting for someone to propose it.

Nothing was done until the Soviet Union took advantage of the idea proposed by the majority leader, and dropped a bomb, so to speak, in the lap

of the administration. The result is that the administration says that the Soviet Union has achieved a great propaganda victory.

I do not know why the suggestion was not taken up; why Henry Cabot Lodge, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, did not advance the proposal; why someone in the State Department did not call it to the President's attention; why, in general, we were found to be lagging; why, once again, we are reacting, instead of acting; and why, once again, we have to admit that the Soviet Union is on the offensive and is on the job, adding another victory to its lengthy string of propaganda victories.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Montana for the explanation. It is certainly most discouraging to have ideas developed by Americans taken advantage of by the Communists. I do not know what the answer is, unless some way can be found to alert the State Department to take the initiative in following up the activity of the Soviets.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, I think they do not mean what they say, because tied to the proposal is the corollary that before it would be acceptable to the Soviet Union, we would have to withdraw from our air base complex in Europe and in other areas ringing the Soviet Union.

The Senator from Arkansas knows, as well as I do, that ever since the creation of NATO, the one overriding, predominant aim of the Soviet Union has been to get this country, with its forces, out of Europe—not so much our ground forces in Germany and northern Italy, but to break up the infrastructure of airfields. The Soviets know that in that infrastructure lies our only weapon which can be considered as a really retaliatory one and as a deterrent to aggressive action on their part.

The fact that the Soviet Union has coupled our withdrawal from Europe with the Johnson idea, or the Johnson plan, of a cooperative effort with respect to outer space indicates to me the falsity of their position. They are using an American idea to develop one of their own, and at the same time to put us on the defensive, so that we are once again made to look as though we are in a weak and ineffective position before the nations of the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I certainly would not wish to derogate the importance and broad scope of the proposal made by the distinguished majority leader several weeks ago, nor the importance of the subject to which the distinguished Senator from Montana has addressed himself. I wish that it were possible that the questions of security and peace to which he is speaking could be above partisanship. I do not believe it is possible, but we can hope that partisanship will be minimized. I know that would be the desire of the Senator from Montana.

Simply to keep the record straight, I know the Senator from Montana will agree with me that more than a month ago the President of the United States addressed a letter to Mr. Bulganin, in which he proposed the banning of weapons in outer space.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that was the first proposal about the peaceful control of outer space, either by the Soviet Union or the United States, and it was made by the President.

Second, I think the Senator from Montana knows that recent negotiations, proposals, exchanges of letters have been conducted in the context of possible meetings, the assumption of a possible summit meeting, in which disarmament, missiles as well as conventional weapons, as well as other political questions would come into discussion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator repeat the last part of his statement?

Mr. COOPER. The discussions which have been going forward between the President and Mr. Bulganin have dealt with the question of a summit meeting, subjects which might be discussed, including disarmament, and missiles.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. So the proposal of the President to Bulganin is in context with the subjects to be discussed between the United States and Russia, if a meeting should be held, and in advance of the Russian proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is a relationship, but I point out that as far back as January 7, the majority leader advocated a meeting of this kind through the United Nations. The proposal was taken up by both Democrats and Republicans and was advocated, but nothing was done. There is a relationship, but all the other activities must be considered, too.

Mr. COOPER. As I have said, I am not derogating the importance of the situation or the breadth of the majority leader's proposal. But I thought I should show the full story, by saying that several weeks ago the President of the United States in a note to Mr. Bulganin, made the first proposal about outer space, to bar the use of missiles in outer space.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Kentucky is always fair and accurate. I am glad he has straightened out the record to that extent.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Montana for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate today. I offer, perhaps belatedly, commendation to the distinguished majority leader for having had the wisdom to make the first suggestion in this regard.

I express my complete accord with the views of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] that, to the extent it is possible, these matters should be treated on a bipartisan basis. I know there is no Member of the Senate who feels that way more strongly than does the majority leader.

I think it is clear from what has been said today that mistakes have been made

in our foreign policy concerning the handling of the question of outer space. Perhaps it is not for us to fix the blame; but our responsibility is to look forward and to see what we, as a body charged by the Constitution with the duty of advising with the President on matters of foreign policy, can do to persuade the President to pursue the matter further. It is my strong view that the simple fact that the Soviet Union has won a propaganda victory by taking up a suggestion first made by the distinguished majority leader, is no reason for running away from that suggestion now.

It is still a good idea to have the United Nations take up the matter of outer space and determine whether some kind of binding international agreement can be worked out. In fact, I think everything we can do at this time to strengthen the United Nations and support the President in his efforts to do that and to see whether, even now, we can move ahead with the suggestion the majority leader has made, and to make it fully effective, should be done. I know that those in the White House and those on the other side of the aisle in this Chamber will not discourage the taking of action on that suggestion merely because it came from the majority leader of the Senate.

I hope that, from now on, we shall move forward and get something done, rather than to attempt to assess the blame for the mistakes of the past.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to commend my friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], for having the good judgment to raise this question now, while something can be done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has put his finger directly on the head of this particular matter. I believe it should be considered in the United Nations, only, however, on the basis of its own merits, and away from any corollary proposal which would seek to achieve a diplomatic, strategic, or propaganda objective of the Soviet Union. I believe the latter is the second part of the proposal, and I believe the second part should be ignored. But I believe consideration should be given to the first part, namely, to have the United Nations consider the matter seriously.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; and that was the point I made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to express full agreement with the point which has been made by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], namely, that we have been left in the lurch.

I also wish to concur fully in the suggestion which has been made by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], namely, that it is not too late to act, not even at this late date.

Mr. President, we in this country have been made to appear in a very false light before the eyes of the rest of the world.

We cannot exercise indefinitely our leadership of the Free World, so long as we merely react to Soviet proposals. Freedom cannot be sustained on the basis

of negative reactions to shrewdly timed moves by a very aggressive power.

There is no need for us to be caught in such a position. We have tremendous advantages on our side, if we shall just use them.

First, our country is founded upon a philosophy which has a deep and moving appeal to all men.

Second, we have a record of good-faith dealings to promote the independence of other peoples.

Third, we have the strongest industrial unit that has ever been built in the entire history of humanity.

Yet, Mr. President, somehow, in the eyes of the world, our philosophy is obscured; our record has been perverted; our strength has been pictured as a mere device for imperialism.

Mr. President, it does not take cleverness to advance our position. We do not need advertising experts or skilled propagandists. We have tried them, and they have been found wanting.

What we in this country need is confidence in ourselves and confidence in the willingness of humanity to respond to honorable proposals, honorably advanced.

Although it is late—as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has said—it is not too late. We have lost a propaganda battle; but we have not lost the battle between freedom and aggression.

We can still go before the United Nations with a proposal stripped of all propaganda trappings and founded upon an honest desire to achieve peace through international cooperation.

The overriding importance of outer space to the future of the world was highlighted again just this morning. The Vanguard satellite that we placed in orbit is small; but it is the forerunner of things that are to come—things that are going to come quickly, Mr. President. Soon the skies will be filled with satellites which will do much more than merely go "beep." They will also do much more than merely collect information.

There is a point of no return in the affairs of mankind. There is a stage at which actions become irreversible.

Right now, the world is uncertain and hesitant. We are standing on the threshold of mighty achievements, but we are not certain just what those mighty achievements may be.

In a few years—a distressingly short few years—the uncertain future will become a present reality. There will be a vested interest in the instruments of destruction. Attitudes will have been hardened. What should be mankind's greatest cooperative adventure will be, instead, a savage battle for the control of the universe.

Mr. President, I am convinced that no one nation can ever achieve the goal of controlling outer space. But if two great nations try to achieve such a goal, the end result will be destruction on a scale beyond our wildest nightmares.

Let us forget about propaganda battles. Let us forget about slogans and catchwords. Let us forget about transitory advantages.

Instead, Mr. President, let us push forward as boldly in peace as we would in war. Let us trust the good judgment and the good will of humanity. It is a force which, if properly tapped, can be greater than the hydrogen bomb.

I hope this country will go forward and will offer boldly and without reservation to engage in a joint venture, through the United Nations, for the exploration of outer space.

We do not know what lies out there. We do not know what such exploration will bring.

But, Mr. President, we do know that men who work together can live together and can build the kind of world and the kind of universe in which all of us want our descendants to live.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

AID TO INDIA

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the Federal Government has recently decided to allot an additional one-quarter of a billion dollars to India. This means we have given India an estimated 1½ billion American dollars since she obtained her independence. Furthermore, we know that this is not the end.

India says she needs \$1 billion right now. Here we are again, asking the same old questions, which are never answered. Why should we take this money from American producers and give it to India? Why should we not do it? Why should we do it now?

The Senator who preceded me, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], explained the very serious situation that exists in his State. Similar situations exist in other States. Are we to ask the American people at this time to dig down in their pockets and give another quarter of a billion dollars to India?

We are told we must give India this sum, or her 5-year plan will collapse and we are told that in that event India will then probably fall into the open arms of the Soviet Union. So we are to buy her aloofness from Soviet wiles, but we must never, never, never ask her to declare herself opposed to the Communist attack on the freedom of the whole world.

Why should we not give India this money? There are two reasons: First, the United States cannot afford it; second, I cannot believe such a grant would truly be a help to the people of India.

First, we have a national debt of over \$275 billion, and at the rate legislation

is being enacted by this Congress, although only recently we raised the debt ceiling to \$280 billion, we will have to raise it again before Congress adjourns. We are spending money that fast.

So, the Federal Government has spent \$275 billion of money it did not have, over and above what it spent from its monumental tax collections, and the windfall from reducing the value of the dollar to less than 50 cents.

To pay that debt, you and I, Mr. President, and the young people of today, will have to earn this \$275 billion over and above all our current expenditures for our families, and all our taxes for defense and other Government expenditures, including war, if that should befall.

This has all been said before, again and again and again.

The present budget now going through Congress depends on revenues the estimates of which are likely to prove too high. Yet it is proposed that we raise the expenditure side, by stepping up outlays for defense, for roads, for housing, urban renewal, farm aid, schooling, reclamation, rivers and harbors, unemployment insurance, loans to small business, loans for foreign trade, and credits to the CCC to give away American farm products to foreign governments, through soft loans.

There are two bills coming up this week, one providing \$3½ billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the other to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by \$2 billion. Thus, before the week is over the Senate will have committed \$5½ billion.

How clever is the curtain of propaganda over foreign aid, which hides these grim facts about our economic crisis from the public gaze.

Now we come to the second point. Why should we believe the fairy tale that this outlay will help India? Our American money will go to bolster the 5-year plan, but what is the 5-year plan but Socialist economy tyranny over the Indian people?

Socialism has never given the people of any country anything. What have they socialism and all their 5-year plans given the people of the Soviet Union? They have the mightiest war machine in their history. They have an all-powerful secret police at home to keep their own people in a state of terror. But do they have more to eat? More to wear? Better homes to live in?

Even czarist Russia had a superb system for admitting the sons of poor families to the universities.

Why should the people of the United States help to maintain the yoke of socialism about the necks of the Indian people?

The 5-year plan is a Communist governing device, which succeeded in Russia only because of the vast amount of machinery and statistical help supplied by American industry, and because of gifts by this country during and since World War II, and the deals made at Potsdam and Yalta.

The 5-year plan of India is in trouble because it promised too much, because it sent prices too high, because it was not efficiently managed by experienced men.

Are we going to bail out all the Socialist governments which do not know how, properly, to invest the capital wrung from their people, or donated by us?

Let me remind Senators, the Indians are famous traders and businessmen.

They have carried on a large part of the trading in Asia.

They operate throughout eastern Africa, and even in our West Indies.

They probably could teach us plenty about business operations.

The Indians, years ago, built up enterprises such as a fine steel mill operation, with private capital and the help of private American citizens, who were employed by private business without having the American Government involved at all.

Why should we penalize the producing classes of India by building up a government-controlled economy in place of a rapidly growing private economy?

Why should we help put the Indian people under the economic rule of planners, when Indian native commonsense and business acumen would bring them in increasing measure, both higher earnings and genuine liberty?

I believe the United States cannot offer the world any genuinely anti-Communist program, unless that program is dedicated to liberty, and socialism is not liberty.

That means we must end our policy of helping governments establish economic dominion over their people, which is not efficient enough really to raise living standards, and which we must bail out by adding to the heavy taxes our people are already paying.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have just listened to my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana. We came to the Senate at the same time, in 1947. We are good personal friends, but I disagree with his speech.

I did not expect this afternoon to be called upon to rebut the speech of my friend from Indiana, who is a member of my party.

As Senators know, I had the honor of serving for a time as Ambassador to India in 1955-56. I went to a country which I had never visited. Since my return to the Senate I have not attempted to lecture in the Senate about India. I think I have been fairly quiet.

Nevertheless, as a man of some maturity, I believe, and one of reasonable powers of observation, I had to make my judgment about India during my stay in that country. I was called twice to return to the United States to testify before the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations of the Senate and House, and before the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, to give my views upon the economic and political situation in India; and our relations with that country.

I have always been pleased that in 1955 and 1956, in addition to the regular group to whom I made those presentations, many other groups in the Congress asked me to talk to them. When I had finished, I numbered up those in the groups and from that I had talked to

some 250 Members of the House and Senate. They were very much interested in what was happening in India and anxious that our relations should be harmonious. I was pleased that they had interest and, I believe, confidence in the views which I expressed.

I know there are some persons who say that American representatives are "taken in." I do not live very far from the distinguished Senator from Indiana. We both live in the same kind of community—a small, rural community. We grew up with the same kind of people, who had the same backgrounds. We both served in the armed service. We have had many, many experiences which were similar; but we disagree politically on the issue of foreign aid, and on other international issues.

I think the Senator from Indiana, whatever he may think about my views, on these issues on which we disagree, believes that my judgment is my own.

In the few articles I have written about India and the speeches I have made, I have tried to be objective and to refrain from speaking of things which might appeal deeply to me, such as human goodness which would lead a people more highly favored, helping other people. I have spoken chiefly on the basis of self-interest, the self-interest of our country, the United States.

The distinguished Senator and I disagree upon the subject of foreign aid. He is not very strong for foreign aid.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I favor a foreign-aid program, and I hope it will be made more effective and more useful. I expect, before the debate takes place on that subject, to express some views, drawn from my experience, which I hope will make the program more effective and in time more economical.

If the Senator debates the loan to India on the basis of the fact that he disagrees with the foreign-aid program, that is understandable.

I recognize there is a great appeal now to an opposition to a foreign-aid program, on the ground that we are in a recession. The argument has appeal. I know back home, in Pulaski County, Ky., and in many other counties in the eastern area of the State where I live—and I am very proud of the people who reside in the mountain section there—there are those who are out of work. Many ask me, "Why do you support a foreign-aid program, when we need so many improvements in our own State and in our own country?"

We are having our economic troubles today but I think of foreign aid as I think of defense. Whatever the situation in our country, we cannot forget that the defense and the security of the United States, are issues that stay with us.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Those words sound good. The defense of our country is a great thing. But will the Senator point out to me one instance in which India, after the gift of \$1½ billion from our

people to the Government of India, has decided any question of foreign policy, in connection with any major problem, on the side of this country? She either remains neutral or sides with Russia. We are spending \$40 billion this year to prepare a defense against communism; yet India, of which the Senator speaks so kindly, will take our money and either remain neutral or side with Russia, on every problem.

Can the Senator point out another example?

Mr. COOPER. I disagree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. JENNER. Can the Senator cite another example?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's ideas about other countries, and what effect their policies have upon our security, differ from mine.

Mr. JENNER. I am not talking about other countries. I am talking about India. So far as aid to Poland is concerned, the situation is worse and less justifiable. Can the Senator point out one instance of India having sided with this country, which has given her \$1½ billion?

Mr. COOPER. I would be very happy if every country in the world would agree with the United States. But every country in the world is not going to agree with the United States on every issue. One of the mistakes this country would make, would be to insist that every other country in the world must agree with the United States on everything, if they are to have our friendship and support.

What is it that we are seeking in the world? We are seeking, I think, security. We want this country to be safe. We want it to be free. We want it to be secure.

One thing which will determine our security in the long run, will be whether other great countries of the world which are now democratic, will remain democratic or will fall under the domination of Russia. I have heard the distinguished Senator and other colleagues, stand on the floor of the Senate during the past 10 years and speak about the loss of China to communism. For 10 years we have cried about China. I agree with my colleague that if China were not a Communist country today, the balance of world power would, without question, be upon the side of the democracies of the world, and security and freedom in the world would be brighter. But now China is gone.

Mr. JENNER. I agree with the Senator. China is gone. But will not the Senator admit that the policies which this country carried out helped her to go.

Mr. COOPER. I certainly believe we could have done more; that we should have made the greatest effort for our Chinese allies. The next largest country in the world, in point of population, is India. Years ago Lenin said—and I quote rather loosely—that the path to the conquest of the West and the democracies was through Asia, through China and India.

The China mainland is with Russia. Together they have a population of

nearly 800 million. If the Government of India should fail, if its economic programs should fail, and their people should lose confidence in their government—and I say to the distinguished Senator that it is a democratic government; not in our own image, but a democratic government—and if her leaders could not produce economic advancement for her people by democratic means, the great risk is that the people of India, or of any new country seeking better living standards, might turn in another direction, to communism, for advancement.

Those who have talked about China for the past 10 years, would, if they had it in their power, give unlimited sums to the economic advancement of China, if it were free, to help it keep free and among the free countries of the world.

In some respects we are faced with a similar situation with regard to India, except that we have the advantage of the example of China. Are we to be so blind as to repeat our mistake? Let me say to my good friend from Indiana, that I think we have a much better chance to see India remain on the democratic side and grow stronger than was true in the case of China in 1947.

Whatever free China's chances were in the early 1920's and 1930's and after World War II—and I have a great admiration for the Nationalists, as our World War II allies, and as allies today; and I wish they were in power today on the mainland of China—yet they could not bring economic well being to their country and their people. There was a tremendous Communist force in China, with strong leaders, and they won China. The attrition of war, the broken treaties of Soviet Russia, our failure to give adequate help contributed—

Mr. JENNER. The Communist forces won with our help. Let us keep the record straight.

Mr. COOPER. Let us keep the same thing from happening in India.

Mr. JENNER. Let us keep the record straight. Did we not pull the rug out from under Nationalist China?

Mr. COOPER. I think we did; at least—when we failed wholeheartedly to give our aid.

Mr. JENNER. There is no question about it.

I think the Senator has misunderstood my premise. I stated, in the first place, that I did not know how we could ask our people to send to India a quarter of a billion dollars recently—and \$1½ billion in all—when only a few days ago we increased our debt ceiling from \$275 billion to \$280 billion, and when we are expected to make further contingent commitments this week of more than \$5 billion.

Only 30 minutes ago the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] introduced a bill calling for a commitment of another \$2 billion. It is billions here and billions there. I do not know how long America can continue at this rate, trying to support and defend herself, and trying to take care of the rest of the world, particularly when nations like India, in the crucial tests of history, are not even kind

enough to take our side. She is always on the side of our opponents.

If we go down the drain, what will happen to India and all the other countries of the world when there is no one left but us and we are bankrupt? It is important to begin thinking about that issue.

In the first 100 days of the session, God only knows how many billions of dollars we have given out. We shall not have the money to keep the budget balanced. We shall have to raise the debt ceiling again. Some are advocating removing the debt ceiling entirely. We have had inflation in this country in the past 10 years which has reduced the value of the dollar to 40 cents. Do we want a 10-cent dollar?

We have some terrible problems. India may be the finest country in the world. In the first place, I do not think we can afford these programs; and in the second place, I am not in favor of financing socialism, because socialism will not bring liberty; and communism is only socialism with a Russian name.

Mr. COOPER. It is difficult, I will admit, in a time of recession, to make a foreign-aid program popular; yet I make the point that the problems of defense and of security continue, and we cannot cut them off for a few months because we are in a recession. I have confidence that the present recession is temporary. But we cannot remove ourselves from the issue of our defense and security because we are in a recession.

Mr. JENNER. What defense benefits are we getting from India? I think she is siding with Russia.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. JENNER. We have not time to go into that question at length, but the record will clearly show that my statement is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I have been in India, and I have been in Asia. Among the Asian countries, with the exception of the Philippines, and perhaps Japan, there is none which is striving harder for democratic government, for independence, and advancement than India.

Mr. JENNER. I am talking about defense. What good do these programs do us from the standpoint of defense?

Mr. COOPER. If India can become economically stable and maintain its democracy in the years ahead, it will be an influence for security and peace.

What is the alternative? Suppose India fails. Suppose she loses, and her people should turn to communism. Where would we stand then?

Mr. JENNER. I will ask my question again. What will happen to us if we go broke? Where will we stand, if we become a bankrupt and destroyed nation?

How could we have a defense? Does the Senator think India would come over here and defend us? If so, with what? Only with what we give her, apparently.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is arguing the issue of foreign aid. We disagree upon the question of foreign aid.

Mr. JENNER. Of course, we disagree.

Mr. COOPER. I wished to answer the Senator's statement that we were financing and aiding a Communist country. There is nothing further from the true facts than that.

Mr. JENNER. I said a Socialist country, not a Communist country.

Mr. COOPER. India, in its plan, has adopted certain principles of governmental ownership. They are not what I would approve for this country. However, I will say there is less public ownership in India than there is in the United States. That might be of interest to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Yes; it would be.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill which I introduced for myself and on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3502) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. YARBOROUGH), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the bill would immediately provide \$75 million in emergency airport aid and extend to Federal Aid to Airport Act for 4 years, which act will expire in 1959.

In the present program the Federal Government matches 50 percent of the money spent by cities or local authorities in the construction of airports. The program is working well, but the funds provided in the present act are insufficient to meet the needs of the local communities which have voted airport funds and are now waiting in a long line to receive the money that has been promised them for their airport-construction work.

Mr. President, within a few months, and certainly before the end of the year, there will be in use both on the trunk airlines and on the international airlines many of the huge jet transport planes, carrying 125 to 150 passengers, and requiring new types of runways with lengths of up to 12,000 feet and new types of aprons.

Under the present act it is impossible to allocate more than \$1 million of the \$63 million a year to any single airport. I know from personal experience that major improvements will have to be made to meet the requirements of the jet transport age. Cities which expect to be on the jet transport schedules will have to spend between five and fifteen million dollars or more in order to be ready. If

there are available only the limited funds which we prorate at a maximum of \$1 million a year to any one airport—to match the funds that have been voted by the cities—we will stretch out the work program by perhaps 5 to 7 years.

We cannot afford to wait that long, because the jet air age is upon us. For that reason, and for the reason that there is a vast growing unemployment in the country, I feel, and the coauthors of the bill feel, it would be wise to add at least \$75 million of additional matching funds to the Airport Aid Act. This would mean the work could start immediately upon the passage of the bill, and in that way put literally thousands of unemployed people to work.

As I said, the bill would provide immediately \$75 million in emergency airport aid and extend the Federal Aid to Airport Act for 4 more years at a rate of \$100 million a year, rather than at the present annual rate of \$63 million.

This is the type of program that the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has been pleading with Congress to accelerate. It is the type of work that has been necessary and needed, but which has been slowed down or stretched out or made expensive because of the small dribbles of Federal money which have been made available.

I discussed the bill with the majority leader before I introduced it, and he has urged us to include the proposed amount. When the Aviation Subcommittee takes up the bill, we will consider enlarging the amount if the municipalities involved can show us that they have work ready and blueprinted and in a condition that can be made less expensive by expediting the program through the immediate authorization and appropriation of this emergency depression erasing device.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the legislation proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma is of far-reaching importance.

It is a challenge to act with speed worthy of the jet age.

The airport construction and improvement projects that would be made possible under this program are both desirable and necessary.

At a time when we are rightly concerned about the number of people who are out of work, these projects would provide constructive jobs in communities all over the Nation.

Mr. President, in my own State of Texas 25 communities are prepared to move forward with airport construction and improvement projects during the 1959 fiscal year if Federal assistance is provided.

The sponsors are asking a total of some \$3,300,000 for this work. They will match that sum locally in the various communities affected.

The situation in Texas is paralleled in other States.

The bill offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is a constructive proposal. It is in tune with the times. It is in accord with the sound principle of cooperative effort between the Federal Government and local units of government for the good of the people generally.

I believe in building airports and in improving airports. And I consider there is economic wisdom in planning to accelerate the work at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the

RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of airport projects in the State of Texas which sponsors are prepared to undertake during fiscal year 1959, and for which they have requested Federal financial assistance.

The list was prepared by the Office of Airports, of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Texas

Location, sponsor, and airport	Description of work requested by sponsor	Federal funds requested
Abilene, city of Abilene, municipal airport.....	Construct new control tower, lengthen north-south runway 850 feet to north with necessary storm sewers and taxiways, extend ramp to north and taxiways from new T-hangars.	\$200,000
Alice, city of Alice, municipal airport.....	Construction of new lighting system on northwest-southeast runway, reconstruct base and paving on outer 10 feet of north-south, northwest-southeast runways.	16,912
Alpine, city of Alpine, Starnes Field Municipal.....	Pave northeast-southwest runway 3,600 by 100 feet.	22,000
Andrews, Andrews County, Andrews County Airport.....	Acquire land, extend north-south runway and northeast-southwest runway, additional taxiways.	37,691
Austin, city of Austin, Robert Mueller Municipal Airport.....	New administration building, grading, pave ramps, access roads, parking areas, acquire land and utility connections; reconstruct north-south runway and remaining portion of northeast-southwest runway and connecting taxiways and acquire clear zone, medium intensity lights on north-south and northeast-southwest runways and connecting taxiways.	930,000
Beaumont, county of Jefferson, Jefferson County Airport.....	Construct taxiways, taxiway and holding apron lighting, construct holding apron north-south runway, construct holding apron northwest-southeast runway.	144,240
College Station, A. and M. College of Texas, Easterwood Field.....	Rehabilitate field lighting and install taxiway lights at turnoff points, runway marking.....	6,000
Colorado City, city of Colorado City, municipal airport.....	Purchase of land, grade north-south runway 4,200 by 100 feet, construct and pave north-south runway, install lights north-south runway, construct taxiway and apron.	102,750
Corpus Christi, city of Corpus Christi, municipal airport (new).....	Light runways and taxiways, entrance road and auto parking, construct terminal building, terminal annex and walkways, construct equipment yard, fencing, utilities, service roads, taxiways to public hangars.	999,113
Del Rio, city of Del Rio and Val Verde County, Val Verde County Airport.....	Land acquisition—reimbursement, construct runway, pave taxi strip and apron, install lights, construct administration building, move and rehabilitate hangars.	58,400
El Paso, city of El Paso, El Paso International Airport.....	Extend northeast-southwest runway 2,850 by 150 feet including taxiway, plus high speed taxiway turnoff system, entire 1 runway; extend high intensity lights and taxiway lights, resurface and strengthen existing taxiway, reconstruct entrance road and auto parking area, install underground gasoline storage and drainage systems, construct aprons.	425,700
Gladewater, city of Gladewater, municipal airport.....	Pave north-south runway 60 by 2,300 feet, airport roads, aircraft parking apron; drainage.....	7,800
Hereford, city of Hereford, municipal airport.....	Airport lighting (northeast-southwest-runway), pave hangar apron and access road.....	16,705
Hillsboro, city of Hillsboro, municipal airport.....	Acquire land site, grade and pave north-south runway (4,000 by 75 feet), pave apron, turn areas and taxiway, administration building and utilities, light north-south runway, access road and auto parking, fence area, grade and drain taxiway, easements.	55,000
Houston, city of Houston, Houston International Airport.....	Northeast-southwest runway extension 735 by 150 feet, taxiway No. 1, 1,600 by 75 feet; terminal building addition, apron pavement, loading finger, auto parking, new northwest-southeast runway, taxiway No. 12, 4,250 by 75 feet, storm sewers, remodel old terminal building, taxiway No. 3.	2,426,500
Houston, city of Houston, municipal airport (new).....	Purchase 3,126 acres of land for new airport.....	930,469
Kingsville, Kleberg County, Kleberg Airport.....	Acquire site and grade, pave runway northwest-southeast 3,500 by 75 feet, pave taxiways and apron, auto parking, administration building, lighting runway northwest-southeast.	75,000
Lamesa, city of Lamesa and County of Dawson, municipal airport.....	Pave road and auto parking, construct administration building.....	12,500
Laredo, city of Laredo, Laredo municipal airport.....	Land acquisition, runway 4,900 by 75 feet, taxiways and aprons, runway and taxiway lighting, terminal building 30 by 40 feet.	134,325
Lubbock, city of Lubbock, municipal airport.....	Enlarge and remodel terminal, sewage line to disposal plant, enlarge auto parking, enlarge and strengthen aircraft parking, center taxiway, taxiway lighting, parallel north-south runway.	355,220
Palestine, city of Palestine, municipal airport.....	Install waterline.....	5,000
Perryton, city of Perryton and Ochiltree County, municipal airport.....	Pave runway and apron.....	44,620
Plainview, city of Plainview and Hale County, Hale County airport.....	Acquire land, aviation easement and reroute road, extend northeast-southwest runway 800 feet and taxiway, control tower.	65,000
Port Mansfield, Willacy County, municipal airport.....	Land acquisition and clear zones, site preparation, pave north-south runway 3,500 by 60 feet, pave parking area 200 by 800 feet, pave access road, lighting of runway and parking, boundary fencing.	12,750
San Antonio, city of San Antonio, San Antonio International Airport.....	Reconstruction and lengthening northwest-southeast runway (12-30) overlay 17-35 and taxiways 6, 9, 11, and 14; additional taxiways, aprons, and lighting; terminal and apron extension, service roadways and utilities, cargo building.	1,188,098
Waco, city of Waco, municipal airport.....	Install high intensity lights runway 18/36, install medium intensity lights runway 14/32, acquire north-south runway clear zone, acquire northeast-southwest runway clear zone, auto parking.	57,794

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I congratulate my beloved friend from Oklahoma for his prompt and constructive action this afternoon.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished majority leader. The same situation that prevails in his State prevails in the States of many other Senators, with whom I discussed the proposed legislation before it was introduced.

Both of these programs—the 4-year \$100 million a year Federal aid program, beginning in fiscal 1960, and the emergency program of \$75 million—are on a 50-50 matching basis for long-range public improvements of a permanent nature. This offers the best opportunity for absorbing a considerable amount of unemployment.

The request for an immediate \$75 million is based on the fact that many cities already have voted bonds and could provide their share of faster-tempo construction, but are prevented from doing so by the lack of matching Federal funds. The emergency fund would be available at once for airports already under construction or under contract.

Many cities are moving as fast as Federal matching funds permit to provide the longer and heavier runways and improved taxiways which jet planes require—before inability to handle jets forces their airports off major airline schedules.

At the same time it offers a chance to get lower rates than usually prevail with contractors and earth movers and paving layers and other contractors in the building of airport buildings—prices that have been impossible to obtain. This is actually strongly supported by facts which have come to us from a national airport survey which has been conducted at their own expense by the Airport Operators Council, and affiliated groups. That survey showed the need for Federal funds of \$150 million a year. Therefore, the proposed annual increase is actually conservative.

The bill which we are introducing today has another feature which will appeal to many Members of the Senate. It would prohibit the use of Federal funds for the construction of parking lots, bars, cafes, and other space rented to concessionaires. We hope and in-

tend to limit the 50-50 percent Federal matching funds to those facilities which serve the public, and which are not rented for revenue-producing concessions which are found at many of the larger airports.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like the Senate to be on notice that later this week, perhaps tomorrow, Wednesday, or Thursday, it is planned to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 706, S. 1356, to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes.

I point out that the bill was reported from the Judiciary Committee on July 18, 1957, and it has been on the calendar since that time. I rather think we shall bring it up by motion, later.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF ROSE WALLACE BENNETT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I believe today we all wish to join in expressing our deep sympathy to our distinguished fellow Senator, WALLACE F. BENNETT, and to the members of his family, upon the death of Rose Wallace Bennett, the Senator's mother.

An eminent daughter of an illustrious Utah pioneer family, Rose Bennett exemplified many of the virtues we cherish and honor. In part her life is a reflection of the life and development of Utah.

Her parents Henry and Elen Harper Wallace came from England, as converts to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, being married in Salt Lake City in 1863. Elen Harper Wallace was among those hardy women who walked the way West.

Henry Wallace worked for Brigham Young, then became an able business executive, a member of the Salt Lake City Council, a patriarch of the 18th Latter-day Saints Ward. Five times he returned to England, on church work and family affairs.

Rose Wallace followed in her mother's footsteps, as a member of the now famed Latter-day Saints Tabernacle Choir, with which she sang not only in Utah but at the Chicago World's Fair in 1893 and in San Francisco in 1896. She received her education at the University of Deseret, from which she gained a teacher's certificate in 1889. Her poetry won place in Utah and English publications.

Her marriage to John Foster Bennett was an event of November 1897. To them were born 3 sons and 2 daughters. Mrs. Bennett—always devoted to her church—faithfully carried out many assignments. In 1896 she was called to the Young Women's General Board of the Mutual Improvement Association, as a member of which she served for 41 years. In 1916 she came to Washington as a delegate to the National Council of Women, and as such long remembered a reception given by President and Mrs. Wilson at the White House, honoring the delegates.

John Bennett had a long and able record in the church and in western business affairs, being senior officer in many business and industrial firms, notably Bennett's Glass & Paint Co.

To John and Rose Bennett their sons and daughters were their chief joy, and the sons have followed their father's example with credit and distinction, in business, in the church. Bennett's today is one of our best-known western firms.

To Senator BENNETT and to his family, I wish—on behalf of us all—to express our condolences. Rose Wallace Bennett

was a mother whose faith in God and man is an inspiration and a guiding light to us all.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I did not have the pleasure of knowing the mother of the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], but she must have been a wonderful woman to have produced such a distinguished, able, patriotic and kind son as the junior Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, I should like to extend my deepest sympathy to the distinguished Senator from Utah and the members of his family.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his kind expressions.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I also join my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and other Senators in their expressions of sympathy for our colleague and friend, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] in the loss of his mother.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). The present occupant of the chair would also like to join the distinguished senior Senator from Utah in expressing his sympathy for the loss of the mother of a truly distinguished public servant and a great American, the junior Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Utah and his family, I greatly appreciate the expressions just made.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 17, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1519) for the relief of Isaac Lidji, Henry Isaac Lidji, and Sylvio Isaac Gattegno.

RECESS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate recessed, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 18, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 17, 1958:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Horace H. Smith, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos, vice J. Graham Parsons.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Herbert B. Warburton, of Delaware, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Walter H. Hodge, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 2, district

of Alaska, for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 2, 1958.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Duncan Wilmer Daugherty, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Fred Elledge, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Tennessee for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Clarence Edwin Luckey, of Oregon, to be United States attorney for the district of Oregon for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

N. Welch Morrisette, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John Burke Dennis, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the western district of Missouri for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Eugene Levi Kemper, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 3: 5: Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not on thine own understanding.

Almighty God, we humbly and penitently confess that again and again we enter upon a new day hesitatingly and wistfully for we fail to put our trust in Thy grace and goodness.

Inspire us to follow Thy leading with a firm step and with a courage of heart which nothing can daunt and a splendor of faith which will never be eclipsed by doubt and despair.

Grant that our plans and purposes for the health and happiness of our beloved country and all mankind may receive Thy benediction and redound to Thy glory.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 13, 1958, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 483. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1519. An act for the relief of Isaac Lidji, Henry Isaac Lidji, and Sylvio Isaac Gattegno.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution